

Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

LONDON, JULY 19, 1879.

CONTENTS.

JOURNAL.

CURRENT TOPICS:—	
The Record and Writ Office	735
The late Mr. E. F. Burton	735
"Grand Committees" of the House of Commons	735
The New Accommodation for the Affidavit and Report Office Work of the Record and Writ Office	735
The Habitual Drunkards Act, 1879	736
Provisional Entry of Causes at Assizes	736
Vacation Judges	736
The Bankruptcy Bill	736
LEADERS:—	
Expenses of Resuming Voyages after Putting into Port of Refuge Turbopike and other Highways in Urban Sanitary Districts	737
Reviews	739
GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE	739
CASES OF THE WEEK	740
SOCIETIES	742
OBITUARY	744
APPOINTMENTS, ETC.	745
LEGAL NEWS	745
CORONERS	746
COURT COURTS	747
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK	747
COURT PAPERS	747
LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c.	748

NOTES OF CASES.

Chitfield v. Sedgwick	740
Stratford, Re, Stratford v. Warren	740
Fletcher v. Lanier	740
Fleming v. Stoker Company	740
Collins v. Barber	741
Berkeley v. The Standard Discount Company	741
The Etham Valley Railway Company, In re, Ex parte Diskson	741

REPORTS.

Attorney-General v. Great Eastern Railway Company (App.)	759
Chapman v. Corps (Ch Div. Fry, J.)	781
Cochrane v. Rymill (App.)	786
Dolphin v. Layton (C.P.Div.)	786
Gold Company (Limited), The, In re (No. 2) (App.)	787
Birt and another v. London and North-Western Railway Company (App.)	787
Hirst, Ex parte, In re Wherry (Bkcy.)	788
Leftley v. Monnington (Ex.Div.)	787
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company, Appellants, Guardians of the Poor of the Parish of Lewisham, Respondents (Q.B.Div.)	783
Norton v. London and North-Western Railway Company (App.)	773
Queen, The, on the Prosecution of The Assessment Committee of St. Mary, Islington, Respondent; The Governor and Company of the New River, Appellants (Q.B.Div.)	785
Robinson, In re, Robinson v. Robinson (Ch.Div. V.C.H.)	781
School Board for London, The, Appellants; Harvey, Respondent (Q.B.Div.)	786
Shaw and others v. The Earl of Jersey (C.P.Div.)	787
Welchman, Ex parte, In re Hare (App.)	774

To CORRESPONDENTS.—All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS. forwarded to him.

Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE WORK of the Record and Writ Office which was removed into the new building in Bell-yard last week, was that connected with the Chancery Division affidavits and the Report Office only. The other work of the Record and Writ department will, we understand, be removed into room 49 of the new building early next week, probably on Monday.

A FIGURE well known in Lincoln's-inn and at the Law Institution passed away last week in the person of Mr.

E. F. Burton, who died at Eastbourne on the 11th inst. Mr. Burton was one of the most prominent members of the great fraternity of London solicitors; he was frequently called upon, as their representative, to give evidence before Parliamentary Committees and to act as a member of Commissions on legal subjects, and he exercised no inconsiderable influence in some of the arrangements consequent on the recent legal changes. One of the latest of these public duties was in connection with the Judicature Acts (Legal Offices) Committee, of which he was a very active member. He took a leading part in the operations of the Incorporated Law Society, and in 1877-8 filled the office of president, and throughout his career did much to urge on the movement the fruits of which we see in the higher social and intellectual status of solicitors. The character of his views on legal subjects was well shown in his address as president of the Incorporated Law Society, when he said that a great revolution which had been for years quietly working its way in the minds of educated and liberal-minded judges and lawyers had found its expression in the Judicature Act. "A solicitor can no longer serve his client's interest by bringing into operation what I will call the mere chicanery of the law; let it be our boast that our profession is second to none in education, high tone, honour, independence, and in enlightened readiness to welcome every sound and well-considered improvement in our laws."

THE SUGGESTION that the Bankruptcy Bill should be referred to a "Select Committee in the nature of a Grand Committee" of the House of Commons, appears to have been based on some misapprehension of the constitution and functions of a Grand Committee. The ancient Grand Committees of the House were not chosen for particular Bills, but were annually appointed for certain general subjects, such as grievances, religion, and courts of justice (see *Lex Parliamentaria*, p. 340). They were really committees of the whole House, to which, says the authority above quoted, "Bills of great concernment were committed to the end that there might be opportunity for further debate; for that at a committee the members have liberty to speak as often as they shall see cause to one question." The object of referring Bills to these Committees was, in fact, to promote discussion, while the main reason alleged by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for favouring the suggestion of the "Select Committee in the nature of a Grand Committee" was that lengthened discussion would be saved. It was hardly possible, he said, that a Bill of 150 clauses could be passed if it was to be debated fully in committee of the whole House. We may add that Sir Erskine May laid before the Select Committee on Public Business, which sat last session, a scheme for the revival of the ancient Committees in a modified form. He suggested that there should be four standing committees on public Bills, devoted respectively to religion and ecclesiastical affairs, law and courts of justice, trade and navigation, and local government and taxation; that each committee should be appointed by a special committee of selection, and that twenty members of each committee should be chosen from members who were "representative men in connection with the different subjects." Then, whenever a Bill was referred to one of these committees ten members might be added to it whose functions would cease with the consideration of the particular Bill. The Select Committee did not, however, indorse this proposal.

CONSIDERABLE CONFUSION and some excitement have prevailed in room 47 of the new building in Bell-yard, to which the Affidavit and Report Office work of the Office of Records and Writs has been removed; nor has the confusion yet quite subsided. To some extent it is easily

explainable,* for with all such removals some difficulty will present itself. It requires some little time for the public to familiarize themselves with new requirements, and for the officials to adapt themselves to their new surroundings. We trust that, for a little while at least, no hasty complaints will come from solicitors, nor any panic-like call for help from the, at present, rather severely-taxed officials. We venture to suggest, however, that some relief might be afforded to the latter, and thereby to solicitors, if two or three of the writers were drafted off from the stationers' department to do the work of entering the affidavits in the indexes. Of course, such relief should be understood to be only temporary, and should continue only so long as the first pressure is felt, and should not lead to anything like a permanent deputing of work properly attaching to, and ordinarily due from, others. That there are, however, in the case some features alike inconvenient and disagreeable no one at all acquainted with the present state of things will dispute. The accommodation—if such it can be called—provided in room 47 is, for its business, very scanty. The part used for inspection is dark even at mid-day. The space available to the public scarcely admits of free movement. The portion allotted to the officials is a sort of narrow slip on the Bell-yard side of the building. A high raised partition or screen separates the officials from the public, the latter having communication with the former through oblong shaped openings, not unlike railway booking-office windows, of which three or four in the Report Office department, and two or three in the Affidavit department have, hitherto, been used. The arrangement, no doubt, protects the officials from disturbing access on the part of the public; but neither have, until now, been thus separated, and, at present, it is evidently felt to be a strange innovation upon accustomed habit. We cannot but express surprise that the requirements of a department with work, not perhaps of the highest order, yet extensive and bringing together a very large number of persons every day, should have been so insufficiently provided for by arrangements inconvenient, and even irritating, to the public, and scarcely less so to the officials.

THE PROVISIONS of the Habitual Drunkards Act, 1879, which have now become law, are novel and curious. "An habitual drunkard" is defined as a "person who, not being amenable to any jurisdiction in lunacy, is, notwithstanding, by reason of habitual intemperate drinking of intoxicating liquor, at times dangerous to himself, or herself [a somewhat painful precision of gender which the draftsman might have spared, inasmuch as by 13 & 14 Vict. c. 61, the masculine includes the feminine], or to others, or incapable of managing himself or herself, and his or her affairs." Such a person may, on his or her own application in writing, be admitted into a "Retreat" licensed by justices, two of whom must attest the application. The applicant may be detained in the Retreat till the expiration of the term mentioned in his application, but not more than twelve months. Sections 25 and 26 provide for his fine or imprisonment if he wilfully neglects or refuses to conform to the rules of the Retreat, and for his apprehension if he escapes before the expiration of his term. There are also elaborate provisions for leave of absence from the Retreat, for appeal against convictions, and for inspection of Retreats by an "inspector and assistant inspector of Retreats," who may be appointed by the Home Secretary. And the 34th section provides that the Secretary of State "may, subject as herein mentioned, prescribe the fees to be paid in carrying out the provisions of the Act." We presume that the qualification has reference to the direction in section 13, that the salaries of the inspectors are "to be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament in that behalf." It seems hard that these or any other expenses attendant

upon the "Retreat" of the *voluntarius dæmon* should fall upon the public.

THE FOLLOWING NOTICE has been issued with reference to the approaching West Riding Summer Assizes:—

"Notice is hereby given, that with the sanction of the Right Honourable Sir George W. W. Bramwell, a list is now open in the Leeds District Registry of the High Court of Justice, 7, Albion-place, Leeds, for the provisional entry of causes for this assize.

"The fee payable on entry of causes will be returned in the case of any cause entered in this list and withdrawn before the opening of the commission.

"All causes entered in this list and not withdrawn, will be entered by the Associate in his list, in the order in which they have been set down in the registry, and in priority to all other causes.

"Notice will be given in the district registry aforesaid of the common jury causes, which will be taken on the first day of the assize.

"THOMAS MARSHALL, District Registrar."

We believe that this action on the part of Mr. Marshall is entirely voluntary and adopted only for the purpose of expediting business. If a similar course should be sanctioned by other judges, and adopted by district registrars in other assize towns, it will go far to carry out the object of Mr. Gregory's amendment on the Supreme Court of Judicature Bill, now before Parliament, as to the entry of causes in district registries. The advantage of the change to the profession, in preventing the scramble on the commission day, is obvious.

THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS made some strong observations, a few days ago, on the wickedness of deluding a vacation judge. We believe that his remarks did not relate to equity counsel or equity matters, but we are not clear that similar observations as to these are uncalled for. Since the Judicature Acts came into operation, we have been familiar with the spectacle of common law judges left at Lincoln's-inn (as Lord Westbury said) all alone in the dark. To them there enter experienced equity counsel proposing to guide them through the darkness, but, it is to be feared, not always leading them the right way. We should be sorry to treat this as a matter for jesting; it is a matter which concerns the honour of the Bar; and we hope the comments of the learned judge, which we publish elsewhere, will put an end to any attempt hereafter to take advantage of the unfamiliarity of any vacation judge with the law he administers. Counsel should never forget that they have a duty to the court as well as to their clients, and that business would come to a standstill unless reliance can be placed on their sense of fairness.

IT WOULD SEEM, from the debate on Wednesday in the House of Commons on the Bankruptcy Bill, that commercial men are coming round to the view of the effect of the Bill entertained by the lawyers. Mr. Sampson Lloyd expressed his apprehension that "if the Bill passed in its present form it would lead to increased expense, and would also involve unnecessary litigation," and Mr. Norwood urged the Government to withdraw the Bill. The Attorney-General is utterly wrong in supposing that the opposition to the Bill comes, as he pleasantly remarked, from "accountants, professional trustees, and fifth-rate solicitors who have fattened upon the present system and the spoil it yields." The obvious interest of solicitors of the class referred to is to support the Bill by all the means in their power; for if it puts a stop to some profitable business it opens new and probably more lucrative sources of income in the numerous applications to the court which it would authorize.

EXPENSES OF RESUMING VOYAGE AFTER
PUTTING INTO PORT OF REFUGE.

THE case of *Atwood v. Sellars & Co.*, recently decided in the Queen's Bench Division (27 W. R. 726, L. R. 4 Q. B. D. 342), is one of great interest with regard to the law of general average. The court were unfortunately divided in opinion, Cockburn, C.J., and Mellor, J., being of one opinion, and Manisty, J., of the other. We are disposed to hope that the case may go to the Court of Appeal, in order that the law on the subject may be settled, for of the importance of the point and the desirability of a decision one way or the other there can be no question. It seems doubtful, however, whether the special case as stated will prove to have sufficiently ascertained the facts to enable a thoroughly satisfactory judgment to be pronounced. The facts were as follows:—A ship on her voyage to Liverpool with cargo encountering severe weather, the foretopmast had to be cut away, and in its fall caused other damage to the ship, which was thereby compelled to put into a port to repair. In order to effect the repairs and to enable the ship to proceed on her voyage, it was necessary to discharge a portion of the cargo, and expense was incurred in landing and warehousing it. The repairs having been effected, expense was incurred in re-shipping such portion of the cargo. Further expense was incurred for pilotage and other charges in respect of the ship's leaving the port of refuge and proceeding upon her voyage. The ship ultimately reached her destination in safety. For from seventy to eighty years it has been the practice of English average adjusters in adjusting losses where ships have put into port to refit, whether such putting into port has been occasioned by a general average sacrifice or a particular average loss, to treat the expense of discharging the cargo as general average, but the expense of warehousing it as particular average, on the cargo, and the expense of re-shipment of the cargo and pilotage, port charges, and other expenses incurred to enable the ship to proceed on her voyage, as particular average upon the freight. The owners of the ship claimed to have the above-mentioned expenses of warehousing and re-shipment of cargo, and the pilotage and other expenses of leaving the port, treated as matter of general average, and sued the owners of the cargo for contribution in respect thereof. It was held by the majority of the court that the plaintiffs were entitled to recover, on the ground that the expenses were all incurred in furtherance of the common purpose of prosecuting the adventure, and for the benefit of the cargo as well as the ship. The dissentient judge thought the practice of average adjusters, as stated in the case, having existed so long, must be deemed to be the general mercantile usage of this country, and to be binding.

We are not satisfied with the reasoning of Mr. Justice Manisty. There are, no doubt, many cases in which custom obtains the force of law, but, as was argued at the bar in the present case, the custom was not of the same nature as many business customs that have been held to be established and to have the force of law. There is no doubt that the alleged practice of average adjusters sprang up simply because the average adjusters sought to conform their practice to the law as they supposed it to be. This is not the case of a usage which depends on the tacit agreement of all persons engaged in a particular trade. There may be cases in which a practice is so inveterate and universal that, though originating from an erroneous notion of the law, it ought to be followed; but we think that nothing short of a universal and long established practice ought to be allowed thus to stereotype erroneous legal notions; and we think that in the case we are discussing it was hardly shown that there was a custom in that sense and to that extent.

Putting aside, for the reasons just mentioned, the question of custom and the grounds of the decision of Mr. Justice Manisty, let us consider for a little the decision of the majority, which deals with the question of principle in-

dependently of any usage. It has been very often said that there is a difference between the law of this country and that of many other nations, including the United States, as to what in such a case constitute general average expenses. In the case of *Walthev v. Mavrojani* (L. R. 5 Ex. 116), this difference was alluded to in the course of the argument, and by Hannen, J., in the judgment. In this country extraordinary expenses incurred for the purpose of continuing the voyage, after it has been interrupted in consequence of a common peril to ship and cargo, as in the case now under discussion, are not necessarily general average. In some other countries it would appear that all extraordinary expenses incurred for the purposes of the prosecution of the common adventure under such circumstances are general average. When the cargo has once been placed in safety our courts have tended to hold that the expenses subsequently incurred for the purpose of the further prosecution of the adventure are for the benefit of the ship only. Montague Smith, J., in the case of *Walthev v. Mavrojani*, seemed to doubt whether in reality there was any difference of principle between the American law and our own, for he says, "The American courts agree that there must be a community of peril and of benefit; the question in each case turns upon the application of the principle to the facts." Parsons, however, in his work on Marine Insurance (vol. 1, p. 390), suggests that the tendency of the American courts and practice is towards making all these expenses general average, whilst that of the English courts is to charge them to the ship alone. In *Walthev v. Mavrojani* the expenses were those of getting off a stranded ship after the cargo had been removed to a place of safety, and these were held not to be general average, on the ground that the cargo being in safety, the expenses were incurred only for the benefit of the ship in order that she might re-ship the cargo and continue the voyage, and so earn the freight. Bovill, C.J., said, in giving judgment, "It is not shown that any advantage resulted to the owners of the goods from their being carried on in that ship rather than in any other"; and Montague Smith, J., said, "I think there may be cases where, though the goods are landed, and so far in safety, yet the adventure of the owner of the goods may still be in peril, as in the case of perishable goods landed on a desert island in a distant and unfrequented part of the world." It is noticeable that Bovill, C.J., throws the onus of proving exceptional circumstances of advantage to the owners of the goods from having them carried on by the same ship, on the ship. *Prima facie*, expenses incurred when the cargo is landed are not general average in his view. So far the *dictum* of Parsons with regard to the English law is justified. But it is also noticeable that Cockburn, C.J., in his judgment in *Atwood v. Sellars & Co.*, apparently throws the onus the other way, for he says, "There is nothing here to show that the goods could have been sent on in another vessel." There seem, in truth, to be no facts found in either of the cases as to this question. It, therefore, seems to us that the more recent case conflicts with *Walthev v. Mavrojani* in principle, and goes far to modify the tendency of the English law in the direction of the law of America and other countries. It is worthy of note that the plaintiff's counsel hardly ventured to argue what the courts have decided. He endeavoured to distinguish the previous decisions, such as *Walthev v. Mavrojani*, on the ground that the damage and consequent necessity for putting into port was originally occasioned by a general average cause—i.e., the cutting away the topmast. It seems to us that the answer to this was crushing. How could the originating cause make any difference as to the duration of the general average act?

If the law of America is wiser and more logical than our own on this subject, the assimilation to it of our own is, perhaps, a result to be desired. It is, no doubt, greatly to be regretted that there should be a conflict of mercantile laws on a matter in which persons of different

nationalities have frequent dealings with one another. We are not, however (setting aside the desirability of uniformity), clear that the law of other countries which differs from our own on this matter is better than ours. The principle all start from appears to be clear. Expenses incurred for the common benefit of all the parties interested in the adventure can alone be general average. It is really a question of fact what expenses are such. The adventure of the shipowner is the voyage of his ship and cargo in safety to a certain port, and the consequent earning of freight. The adventure of the cargo owner coincides up to a certain point. His object is the transmission of his goods to a certain port in safety. But it will be observed that the safety of the ship or the prosecution of the voyage by her is immaterial to him except so far as it may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out his speculation. It seems to us that the doctrine which *Atwood v. Sellars & Co.* establishes is that it must be presumed that it is for the advantage of the cargo owner that the goods should be carried on in the same ship. Now this may very frequently be the case, but we cannot at present see why there should be a presumption in the matter one way or the other. There must be cases not infrequently occurring in which it would be decidedly contrary to the cargo owner's interest that the goods should be carried on in the same ship, especially at the price of having to contribute to the expenses of enabling her to carry them on. The Lord Chief Justice rests his judgment on the supposed agreement which would be presumably made by the various parties interested, if on board at the time of the common peril, when the question whether the ship should bear up for a port of refuge was mooted. He appears to assume that they would all agree that the ship should make for the port, and after the necessary repairs should pursue the voyage, and so prosecute the common adventure. But we should think that the agreement which would presumably be made would be that for the common safety the ship should bear up for the port, without prejudice to the question what should be done in future. The cargo owner would say to the shipowner, "It is obvious that, for the sake of all parties, we must seek a port of refuge, but whether after that it is fair or reasonable that I should be compelled to send my goods on by your ship for the remainder of the voyage must depend on many circumstances, as to which the elements of a decision are at present wanting." The goods, for instance, might be perishable, and the necessary repairs might take a long time. It seems to us that the further prosecution of the adventure must be taken to be the result of a subsequent agreement entered into by the parties after the port of refuge is reached. If it should happen that, in fact, the adventure of the cargo owner is in peril unless the voyage is prosecuted and his goods are carried on in the ship, then it will appear that the expenses subsequent to the landing of the cargo should be general average, because incurred for the common benefit. The truth is that in such case the cargo, regarded as a mercantile speculation, is not in safety upon being landed. A cargo cannot, in any practical sense of the term, be said to be safe if, to use the illustration of Montague Smith, J., it is landed on a desert island in a distant and unfrequented part of the world. Its future safety then would depend on the safety of the ship. It appears to us that in every case it must be a question of fact whether the prosecution of the voyage in the same ship is necessary in the interests of the cargo owner as well as those of the shipowner, or whether it is for the interest of the latter only.

We are unable to see at present why there should be any presumption in the matter. The interest which the Lord Chief Justice takes in the subject of international and foreign jurisprudence, and the tendency of his mind to look widely around for such light as may be derived from the laws of other countries on doubtful points in our own law, are well known. We cannot help thinking that his judgment has been somewhat influenced by the

desire that our law should be uniform with that of the bulk of maritime nations. We cannot say, however, that his reasoning has convinced us that the tendency of our law on this subject, as contrasted with that of other nations, was wrong or illogical. On the contrary, it appears to us the more logical of the two. If the law be as it is now laid down in *Atwood v. Sellars & Co.*, it seems to us that it must be based on some considerations of expediency which at present are not made clear. Conceivably, it may be expedient that some general rule based upon experience of what occurs in the vast majority of cases should prevail rather than that in every case an elaborate investigation should take place as to what might or might not in the particular case be most for the advantage of the cargo owner. We do not profess to be sufficiently acquainted with shipping matters to know whether it is expedient that such a rule should be established. All we can say is that it appears to us that it would be an arbitrary rule, and we should suppose that there is no such nearly universal preponderance of experience on one side as to make such a rule expedient notwithstanding its arbitrariness.

TURNPIKE AND OTHER HIGHWAYS IN URBAN SANITARY DISTRICTS.

THE case of *Nutter v. The Accrington Local Board* (L. R. 4 Q. B. D. 375), raised a point of considerable importance and interest. The Queen's Bench Division, consisting of the Lord Chief Justice and Mellor, J., having decided one way, their decision was reversed by the majority of the Court of Appeal; Brett and Cotton, L.J.J., being of one opinion, and Bramwell, L.J., of the other. The case very well illustrates the difficulties that arise from interpretation clauses. One cannot help fearing that these clauses are not unfrequently put in somewhat at random, without the draftsman having carefully tested the effect of them by reading the interpretation into every section in which the word interpreted occurs. The main question in the case we are now discussing was whether section 68 of the old Public Health Act (11 & 12 Vict. c. 63), which vests in local boards the streets within their districts, and imposes on them the duty of repairing, &c., such streets, applied to a street which was also a turnpike road. It will be remembered that the present Act is only a consolidation Act, and re-enacts for the most part the provisions of the former Acts, and consequently this point is still of importance. The interpretation section of the Act says that the word "street" shall apply to, and include, any highway not being a turnpike road. The majority of the Court of Appeal held that this definition was not exhaustive, but merely extended the meaning of the word "street"; in other words, that the meaning was that all streets in the ordinary sense of the term—that is, roads with a more or less continuous line of houses—should be included, and, in addition, of roads that would not in ordinary parlance be streets, there should be included such highways as are not turnpike roads.

It is, undoubtedly, very difficult to deal with this question satisfactorily. There are numerous provisions with regard to streets which are of great importance as matters of town government—for instance, provisions as to the line of the street and projections into it from premises abutting thereon. There is no reason why these should not apply to a street which is a turnpike road, so far as we can see. But, again, we cannot help doubting, if the real intention of the framers of the interpretation clause could be ascertained, whether they could have meant the 68th section to apply to turnpike roads under any circumstances. It seems to us probable that the framers of the Act, perceiving that there might be a conflict of jurisdictions, and it being quite impossible to deal with it properly within the scope of the measure that was sought to be then passed, resolved to exclude

turnpike roads from the definition of streets. The 41st section of the Local Government Act, 1858, seems at first confirmatory of this view, although Cotton, L.J. appears to have thought otherwise. It provides that the local board may, by agreement with the trustees of any turnpike road, take upon themselves the maintenance, repairs, &c., of the road. It, therefore, seems to be implied by this section that, in the absence of an agreement between the board and the trustees, the board cannot take on themselves the maintenance, &c., of the road, and, if so, of course the road cannot be within section 68. There is, however, a possible answer to this argument. The section not only provides as above, but goes on to say that the board may remove toll bars situate within two miles of the centre of any town within their district. It may be said that the arrangement contemplated by the section is one by which the board, taking upon themselves the repair of the part of the road within the town, may remove the bar, and that it is to the removal of the bar, not the maintenance of the road, that the agreement is necessary. We are disposed to think that this may be an answer to the argument derived from the 41st section. We imagine that the decision is contrary to what was generally supposed to be the meaning of the Act, but we do not know that that is any argument against it. We do think, however, that such an interpretation clause is likely to lead to misapprehension and doubt, and that it was a very natural construction of it that it excluded turnpike roads.

There are many difficulties with regard to highways in local board districts. Some of these may hereafter crop up for solution. It will be observed that the Act of 1875 re-enacts substantially the provisions of the former Acts, and that by it the "streets," i.e. (*inter alia*), all highways not turnpike highways, are vested in the local board, and the local board is made the surveyor of highways. But sufficient care has not been taken to dovetail the general law with regard to highways into the provisions relating to local boards. Under the ordinary law on the subject, the inhabitants of a parish were liable to indictment for non-repair of the highways within it. As far as we can see, there is great doubt as to how matters exactly stand in local board districts. The local board ought by express words to have been substituted for the inhabitants at large in respect of all liabilities with regard to highways. This has not been done, and it is not at all easy to say how far the old law on the subject of the liability of the inhabitants of the parish stands or does not stand. This illustration may be taken. It will be observed that a parish may be partly within and partly without a local board district, and in such case if the excluded part chooses to be a highway parish by itself it may: see section 216. In such a case, what has become of the liability of the inhabitants of the former parish? Must not the local board be responsible for the non-repair, and, if so, are they liable to an indictment? If not, who is so liable? We are not aware that these questions have ever been thoroughly worked out.

On Tuesday evening the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the Government are of opinion that the Corrupt Practices Bill ought to be fully considered by the House and settled before a dissolution. "Whether," he continued, "it will be possible to proceed with it this session I am very uncertain; I am afraid not. But it is among those Bills we have not taken off the paper, though it is not possible at this moment to say when we can find time for it."

The *Central Law Journal* says that 379 cases were disposed of in the United States Supreme Court during the term recently ended, but the number of cases on the docket, including those considered this term, has increased to 1,150. The court is now more than three years behind in its business. The comparison of work this term with that of last shows a decrease of thirty-two in the number of cases finally cleared from the docket. The court is now seventy-two cases farther behind than at the close of the October term, 1877.

Reviews.

TRUSTS.

A PRACTICAL TREATISE ON THE LAW OF TRUSTS. By the late THOMAS LEWIN, Esq. Seventh Edition. By FREDERICK ALBERT LEWIN, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. W. Maxwell & Son.

It is of much importance to a large section of the profession that this valuable book should be kept up to the standard of accuracy and completeness it attained during the life of the lamented author. We may say at once that, on the whole, this edition appears to us to have been edited with intelligence and caution. Within the range of investigation which the editor appears to have prescribed for himself, he has collected the cases with industry. We have not found any *Law Reports* cases of any importance omitted; but we think it would have been desirable to have gone beyond the *Law Reports*. We fail to find any reference on p. 231, or elsewhere, to the decision of Fry, J., in *Rodbard v. Cooke* (25 W. R. 555), relating in the liability of a trustee who places the trust fund under the sole control of his co-trustee. Under the head of the wife's separate estate no reference appears to be made to *Roberts v. Watkins and Howells* (46 L. J. Q. B. 552); and in the statement, in the note on p. 884, that the court will not appoint persons trustees who are resident out of the jurisdiction, no allusion is made to *In re Austin's Settlement* (38 L. T. 601), where Vice-Chancellor Malins appointed as trustees two persons residing in Ireland. On p. 504, as to the power of trustees to execute improvements on the trust property, a reference to *Re Lee's Trusts* (32 L. T. 298) would be useful, although this case is mentioned at p. 535. Moreover, we observe references only to the *Weekly Notes* where the cases referred to have been fully reported. Thus, *Fazakerly v. Culshaw* (p. 505) is reported, 19 W. R. 793, and *Jones v. Jones* (p. 65) is reported, 23 W. R. 1.

The effect of the cases is, in general, accurately and shortly stated—e.g., at p. 338, the effect of *Maddy v. Hale* is very neatly given. We should, however, occasionally have wished for a little more detailed statement; it is hardly fair to the practitioner, for instance, to dismiss *Tolson v. Sheard* (25 W. R. 667) with this remark, in a note on p. 395, "As to the power of trustees to grant a lease of two estates held upon different trusts, see *Tolson v. Sheard*." This formula of "As to, &c." is too often the indication of a desire to avoid the trouble of stating the precise result of a case.

We have mentioned some points in which, after a careful examination of this edition, we think it might be improved. But we are bound to say that, as it stands, it is likely to sustain the reputation of the work.

General Correspondence.

NOTARIES.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Referring to the letter of your correspondent under the above heading in your issue of last week, allow me to say that, although I am a solicitor of more than ten years' standing, I nevertheless thoroughly indorse your correspondent's observation that, "It seems manifestly unfair that solicitors who have not yet attained ten years' standing should be called upon, in order to qualify for a notary, to pass an examination which their brethren of ten years' standing escape."

It is during the first few years of his career that a solicitor finds it most difficult to make progress in his profession, and then is the time when he is glad to avail himself of any public appointment open to him, whereas if the proposed restriction is inserted in the Bill about to

be introduced, it will tend to confine notarial appointments to solicitors who have already attained a standing in the profession, and who do not need the aid afforded by such appointments so much as their younger brethren.

It would, therefore, seem desirable that the appointments should be open to all solicitors who have passed the Final Examination, which could be made a sufficient test of fitness for admission either to the roll of solicitors or notaries, or to both.

J. R. E.

July 16.

Cases of the Week.

COSTS—SUM LESS THAN £20 RECOVERED—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, SECTION 67—CLAIM AND COUNTER-CLAIM—REFERENCE TO MASTER—COSTS TO ABIDE EVENT.—In a case of *Chatfield v. Sedgwick*, before the Court of Appeal on the 9th inst., a question arose on the construction of section 67 of the Judicature Act of 1873, and there was some question as to the effect of a reference of an action (including a claim and a counter-claim), to the master, with a direction that the costs of the action should "abide the event." Section 67 provides that, "The provisions contained in the 5th, 7th, and 10th sections of the County Courts Act, 1867, shall apply to actions commenced or pending in the High Court of Justice in which any relief is sought which can be given in a county court." By the 5th section of the Act of 1867 it is provided that, if in any action in any of the superior courts the plaintiff shall recover a sum not exceeding £20, if the action be founded on contract, or £10, if founded on tort, he shall not be entitled to any costs of suit, unless the judge certify on the record that there was sufficient reason for bringing the action in a superior court, or unless the court or a judge at chambers shall by such an order allow such costs. The action was brought by a builder against a greengrocer in respect of work done by the plaintiff for the defendant. The writ was indorsed with a claim for £97. The defendant delivered a defence and counter-claim, and by the counter-claim he claimed £24 for goods supplied to the plaintiff. An order was made referring the action to the certificate of the master; "the costs of the action to abide the event, the costs of the reference to be in the discretion of the master." The master found that £16 was due to the plaintiff on his claim, and that £23 was due to the defendant on his counter-claim, and he allowed the defendant his costs of both claim and counter-claim, and gave the plaintiff no costs at all. The Court of Appeal (Jesse, M.R., and Brett and Cotton, L.J.J.) held that the decision as to the costs was right. It was urged that the plaintiff was entitled to his costs of claim because he had succeeded in recovering something, and that section 67 did not apply, because the writ having been indorsed for a sum exceeding £50, the action was not one in which relief was sought which could be given in a county court. Jesse, M.R., said that such a construction of section 67 would, in effect, repeal it altogether, as a plaintiff could always escape from its operation by indorsing his writ with a claim for a sum exceeding £50. The words "relief which can be given in a county court" referred to the kind of relief that could be given, not to the amount claimed. The test was the amount recovered. The plaintiff, therefore, could not have any costs of his claim. And, with regard to the costs of the defence to the claim, the matter was referred to the master to decide the whole question between the parties, and the costs were to abide the event. That meant the whole costs. The party who won the action as a whole was to get the costs of the whole. Brett, L.J., said that section 67 was intended to apply to the amount for which the action ought to have been brought, not the amount indorsed on the writ. And the "event" referred to in the reference to the master was the decision of the master as a whole, which in this case was for the defendant, there being in the result a balance of £7 due to him.

ADMINISTRATION ACTION—INFANT—IMPROPER INSTITUTION OF ACTION—COSTS—NEXT FRIEND.—In the case of *Re Stratford, Stratford v. Warren*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 14th inst., the action was instituted by a next

friend, on behalf of an infant interested under a will, for the administration of the testator's estate. The estate consisted of a small public-house, of which a receiver, was appointed, and by consent the public-house was subsequently sold and realized a sum of about £340. There was also a debt of £80 due to the estate, and this was got in, so that the total assets were worth about £420. A creditor had been made a defendant and he claimed a debt of about £240, which had been advanced to the defendant, the executrix, to pay the testator's debts. This defendant appeared by the same solicitor as the plaintiff. The action now came on for further consideration, and it was stated that the costs of the executrix would amount to about £150, so that, after deducting the sum due to the creditor, and the costs of the plaintiff and the defendants, there would have been nothing left for the infant. The question was argued as to how the costs of the action should be borne. The Master of the Rolls was of opinion that the action had not been *bond fide* instituted for the benefit of the infant; the next friend was apparently a stranger to the family, and the real object evidently was to obtain payment for the creditor of his debt by securing the assets by the appointment of a receiver. The creditor could have obtained payment in an action without necessitating the expense of taking the accounts in chambers. Unfortunately he could neither order the creditor to pay the costs, nor the solicitor, who really ought to do so, and all he could do to mark his sense of the impropriety of the action was to order the next friend to pay the costs of the executrix, not exceeding £100. The creditor would get no costs, and must bring into court the sum admitted to be in his hands, as allowed him twice over. There was an amount due to the executrix, and this must be paid and the balance carried over to the account of the infant. In this way something would be left for him, and much the same as if the action had not been instituted.

PRACTICE—EX PARTE INJUNCTIONS—DUTY OF COUNSEL.—In a case of *Fletcher v. Lorier*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 11th inst., a motion was made to restrain the defendant from committing a breach of an agreement under which a partnership between the parties had been dissolved. It appeared that an *interim* injunction had been obtained from one of the vacation judges, whose attention had been called to the affidavit filed in support of the motion, and which affidavit had been read by the judge. On the motion coming on before the Master of the Rolls, he stated that he considered the *interim* order had been improperly granted, and that the real bearing of the facts could not have been properly brought before the judge, notwithstanding that he had read the affidavit. In his own court he always trusted to counsel not to apply for *ex parte* injunctions in improper cases, or if they did apply in a doubtful case, then he expected that the difficulties should be fully mentioned to him. Where so many *ex parte* injunctions were granted he could not administer justice in any other way, and he must necessarily trust to counsel to an enormous extent. If any counsel had obtained from him the injunction which had been granted by the vacation judge, whether he himself had read the affidavit or not, he certainly should have made some strong comments on his conduct. He considered the injunction ought not to have been granted.

PRACTICE—MOTION TO VARY—REPORT OF OFFICIAL REFEREE—MOTION OR SUMMONS.—In a case, also before the Master of the Rolls on the 11th inst., a motion was made to vary the report of an official referee, and it was stated to involve some argument and discussion on the facts. Counsel stated they would not ask his lordship to hear it on a motion day, but would ask that it might be treated as an adjourned summons, and be placed on the list of adjourned summonses. The Master of the Rolls directed this to be done, and said that, of course, people might move to vary the report of a referee, but such proceeding was generally taken by summons and adjourned into court.

COMPANY—VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION—EXAMINATION OF OFFICER—MOTIONS OR SUMMONS—COMPANIES ACT, 1862, s. 138—GENERAL ORDERS, NOVEMBER, 1862, ORDER 51.—In the case of the *Steam Stoker Company*, now in course of

voluntary liquidation, a motion was made before the Master of the Rolls, also on the 11th inst., for leave to examine an officer of the company under the 15th section of the Companies Act. It was stated that, in a voluntary winding up, there was some doubt as to the practice whether such an application was not required, under order 51 of the General Orders of November, 1862, to be made by motion, although in a compulsory winding up such applications were always made by summons in chambers. The Master of the Rolls said that, under the rule, he had given a general direction that such applications should be made by summons, and that was the proper practice. On the present motion he would give leave to issue a summons in chambers for the examination.

COMPANIES ACT, 1862, s. 124—SETTLEMENT ON LIST OF CONTRIBUTORIES TO COMPANY IN LIQUIDATION—SUMMONS TO REMOVE NAME—LAPSE OF TIME—THREE WEEKS' LIMIT.—In a case of *In re The Elham Valley Railway Company, Ex parte Dickson*, which came before Mr. Justice Fry, sitting for Vice-Chancellor Malins, on the 15th inst., the applicant, Major Dickson, agreed to become a director of the company towards the end of 1866, and a qualification of fifty shares was found for him. He was entered on the register as the holder of fifty shares, his name appeared in the prospectus of the company, and he attended some of the board meetings, signed share certificates, and took a part in the management of the company. In July, 1867, he resigned his seat on the board, and from that time ceased to take any part in the affairs of the company. In August, 1874, an order was made by Vice-Chancellor Malins to wind up the company. When the list of contributories came to be settled, Major Dickson objected to his name being placed on the list; but when the case came before Vice-Chancellor Malins, on March 19, 1877, he directed that the name should be entered on the list, which was done by the chief clerk accordingly. The certificate of the settlement of the list was dated July 1, and filed July 9, 1878. Being under the impression that the call would be one of a trifling amount, Major Dickson at first took no steps to obtain the removal of his name from the list, but when he became aware that a heavy call, to the extent of £9 a share, was being made by the liquidator, he took out a summons, asking that his name might be struck off the list of contributories, such summons being dated April 17, 1879. When the summons came on for hearing before Mr. Justice Fry, a preliminary objection was taken by the liquidator, on the ground that the question had already been judicially decided, and that the applicant was too late in making his application. Fry, J., said that it was obvious that great inconvenience would be occasioned if a summons such as the present one could be successful whenever brought. It might be said no injury would be done by the removal of the name at this time, since no call had been previously made, but if this name were removed all others might be, and so, after a year had elapsed from the time when the list was settled, the liquidator would not know on what he could depend. In his lordship's view the 124th section of the Companies Act, 1862, applied. In point of expression it did not directly govern the case, or prohibit applications for orders to discharge after three weeks, but to such cases the same limit of time should be applied by analogy. The cases of *Ex parte Brown* (22 W. R. 602, L. R. 9 Ch. 304), and *Dickson v. Harrison* (L. R. 9 Ch. D. 243, were in point), and he intended to follow the 124th section, and held that such an application could not be made as of right after three weeks had elapsed from a judicial decision. With regard to the exercise of his judicial discretion, his lordship did not think fit to exercise it in favour of one who had chosen to speculate on calls against costs, and the application would be dismissed, with costs.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—LEGACY—VESTING—GIFT OVER ON DEATH OF LEGATEE BEFORE TESTATOR OR BEFORE "DIVISION" OF HIS ESTATE.—In a case of *Collison v. Barber*, before Fry, J., on the 7th inst., a question arose as to the vesting of a legacy. A testator devised and bequeathed all his real and personal estate to trustees, upon trust for sale and conversion with all convenient speed after his death, and out of the proceeds to pay his debts and funeral and testamentary expenses, and, subject thereto, and to the payment of an annuity, to answer which the trustees were to invest a part of the proceeds of sale, the trustees were to

divide the remainder of the trust moneys equally amongst two nephews and four nieces of the testator, who were named in the will. He directed that the shares of the nephews should be paid to them as soon after his death as practicable. The shares of the nieces were to be invested by the trustees, and the income paid to the nieces for their separate use. And he directed that in case any or either of the nieces should die "before me or before the division of my estate as before directed" unmarried, the share or shares of the niece or nieces so dying should be divided among the remaining legatees named in his will. Both the nephews and all the nieces survived the testator. He died in December, 1875. One of the nieces died unmarried on the 17th of April, 1876. The testator's debts were of small amount compared with the amount of his personal estate, but they were not all paid until September, 1876. The real estate was sold by the trustees in February, 1876, and the purchase-money was received by them nine days before the death of the niece. The trustees did not make any actual division of the property among the legatees until October, 1876. The question was whether the share of the niece who had died had gone over to the other nieces and the nephews. It was contended that it had not, because, the debts being of such small amount, a partial division of the estate would have been practicable before her death. Fry, J., however, held that the words "division of my estate" must be taken to mean the expiration of the period of one year after the death of the testator allowed by law for the distribution of his estate, and, consequently, that the gift over of the share of the deceased niece had taken effect.

DISCOVERY—MEMBER OF COMPANY—COSTS—ORD. 31 RR. 4, 6, 10.—In a case of *Berkeley v. The Standard Discount Company*, before Fry, J., on the 12th inst., a question arose with reference to the provision of rule 4 of order 31, that, if a party to an action be a joint stock company, "any opposite party may apply at chambers for an order allowing him to deliver interrogatories to any member or officer of such company, and an order may be made accordingly." An order had been made, giving the plaintiff liberty to deliver interrogatories for the examination of a Mr. Stirling, who was a member, but not an officer, of the defendant company. Interrogatories were delivered under this order, and an affidavit in answer to them was prepared, but Stirling refused to file it, unless he was first paid by the plaintiff his taxed costs of the affidavit. The plaintiff then took out a summons to compel Stirling to answer. Fry, J., held that Stirling was justified in his refusal to file the affidavit until he had been paid his costs. His lordship thought it was not reasonable that a mere member of the company should be required to make the discovery asked for at his own expense. He thought that the analogy of a witness, subpoenaed in the ordinary way in an action, applied, and it went to show that the expenses of a person who was called to give evidence should be borne by the person who wanted the evidence. It was said that the provision of rule 6—"Interrogatories shall be answered by affidavit to be filed within ten days"—was imperative. But that, in his lordship's opinion, only meant that the answer should be by affidavit, not *ex officio*. There was nothing, therefore, in the rules to prevent the court from doing that which it considered reasonable in the matter. His lordship had consulted one of the judges of the common law divisions, with the view of ascertaining whether any contrary practice had grown up in the courts of common law with reference to the corresponding provision (section 51) in the Common Law Procedure Act of 1854, or in the common law divisions under the new rules. There appeared to be no such practice, and therefore an order would be made to file the affidavit on payment of the deponent's taxed costs by the plaintiff. The plaintiff must pay the costs of this application. Leave was given to appeal.

The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* says that a resolute effort is now being made to induce the authorities of the various Inns of Court to abolish the examination in Roman law which is necessary with a view to a call to the bar. This attempt has been made before, on the grounds chiefly that the present study of Roman law must necessarily be imperfect and scamped by those who attempt it, and that it is essentially an archeological subject. It is now definitely suggested to substitute as a subject of examination international for Roman law.

Societies.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY. ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

The annual general meeting of this society, convened for the election of a president, vice-president, auditors, and members of the council, and for the transaction of other business, was held at the society's hall on Friday, the 11th inst., Mr. John Hollams, president of the society, in the chair.

The usual formalities with regard to the minutes of previous meetings having been complied with, the PRESIDENT stated the names of the duly qualified candidates to fill the vacancies announced. Each of the candidates was proposed and seconded *seriatim*, and as they were not more in number than were required to fill the vacant offices, Mr. Nathaniel Tetius Lawrence and Mr. John Moxon Clabon were declared to be elected president and vice-president respectively for the ensuing year, and the nominated candidates for the council and for the office of auditors were also declared to be duly elected, Mr. Richard Mills and Mr. Richard Pennington becoming members of the council for the first time.

The accounts of the receipts and disbursements for the year ending the 31st of December, 1878, were then received, approved, and signed by the president.

Mr. GRESHAM wished for information as to the assets of one of the officers of the society, who had misappropriated £12,000, or thereabouts.

Mr. LAKE (the chairman of the Finance Committee) explained that the dividend to be received would be about enough to cover the liquidation expenses, and no more.

The resolution having been put to the meeting was carried, and the account was signed by the president.

On the motion "That the annual report of the council be received, approved, and entered on the minutes."

Mr. GEDGE moved an amendment to the effect that the report be received and adopted with the exception of that part which related to the appointment of notaries. He saw no reason why solicitors of ten years' standing should become notaries, and he considered the "observations" upon the report of the council, which had been prepared and circulated by the Society of Public Notaries very sensible. He considered it very much better that the business of notaries should be kept distinct, and if the increase in the notarial business was such as was stated in the report, the inconvenience arising from the want of notaries would soon be put an end to, as many of the numberless young men now seeking a livelihood would be sure to become notaries.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the report was founded on a resolution passed at the annual provincial meeting held at Bristol in 1877, at which upwards of 200 members of the society were present. At that meeting, after a very long discussion, it was resolved "That it be a suggestion to the council of the law society that, at a fitting time, they should endeavour to bring about an alteration of the law in the direction of providing that all solicitors of ten years' standing and upwards be entitled to act as notaries public." It was not therefore a thing brought forward for the first time by the council.

Mr. GRIEULE recorded the amendment. He considered that a solicitor acting as a notary could not properly do his duty to a client, and that it was utterly impossible for a solicitor of any large practice to undertake the duties of a notary, especially as regards banking business.

Mr. KATS stated that he was appointed notary for India in 1850, and never found any difficulty in the performance of his duty as such, and he never heard of any solicitor appointed as a notary failing to fulfil his duties satisfactorily, and he hoped to see the profession of notary in London thrown open to solicitors, subject to a provision being made in regard to vested interests. He therefore opposed the amendment.

Mr. GODFREY thought that the matter had not been sufficiently under the consideration of the members of the society, and he was of opinion that they were entitled to ask that a copy of the proposed Bill be placed in their hands.

Mr. GILKS said that the mere fact of a solicitor becoming a notary would not compel him to act as such, either for London merchants or bankers, if he found that it interfered with his practice. Merchants and bankers were, of course,

at liberty to choose notaries, and notaries only, to act for them. He was therefore opposed to the amendment.

Mr. JONES (Gloucester) said that the proposed amendment would, in effect, rescind the resolution passed at the annual provincial meeting at Bristol, which would be putting the council in an altogether false position, and he considered the proposal of the council a very sensible one.

Mr. POLLARD and Mr. C. FORD also supported the adoption of the report.

Mr. KEEN said, with regard to the "observations" of the Society of Notaries, it seemed to him that a more complete justification of the steps which the council had taken could hardly be found. He also pointed out that in the country, where it is necessary, solicitors may become notaries without any previous examination or training, and he failed to realize the truth of the assertion that London solicitors were incapable of performing satisfactorily the duties of a notary. He also stated that his private opinion with regard to existing notaries was that they ought to be made solicitors to recompense them for any loss they might sustain.

The PRESIDENT having put the amendment to the meeting, it was negatived.

Mr. WALTER said that before the report was approved he would like to know whether a Bill had been prepared with regard to the restrictions on the call of solicitors to the bar, and what was the present stage of the Bill.

The PRESIDENT stated, in answer to this question, that after a great deal of consideration a Bill had been prepared in reference to this and another subject, which was now in the hands of Lord Selborne in the hope that he would undertake the charge of it in the House of Lords.

Mr. F. K. MUNTON wished to know if the council had carefully considered whether five years was the proper limit, and whether there was any chance of carrying the Bill through. He considered five years too short a term. He also suggested that the time had arrived for the insertion in the annual report of the names of solicitors who had been struck off the roll, and stated that one of the solicitors whose name had, at the instance of the society, been recently struck off the roll had been bankrupt no less than twelve times. He also referred to certain prize essays with reference to bankrupt solicitors, from which it appeared that upwards of one thousand solicitors had become bankrupts since 1861, and he was of opinion that the time had come when the council ought to adopt some proper resolution with reference to the subject.

Mr. PARKER referred to that part of the annual report relating to the applications for probates and letters of administration by law stationers, and expressed great satisfaction at the course the council had adopted. Mr. Parker also drew attention to the large use that is now being made of the library by students, and suggested that now that the council had made so many improvements in the hall in the way of increased accommodation for members, something more should be done for them with reference to the library. At present two-thirds of the library was appropriated by students, members being confined to the lower wing. He also complained of having the library closed on occasions when the number of students is so large that they cannot otherwise be accommodated, and urged that instead of depriving the members of the use of the library the number of days for the examinations should be increased. He also suggested that the students might, with advantage, be entirely confined to the examination hall both for study and the examinations, and thus afford increased room for the members of the society, whose interests ought to be paramount.

The PRESIDENT explained, with reference to the suggestion as to the five years' practice as qualification for call to the bar, that the limit proposed was fixed by the council to correspond with the period for which a barrister must have practised after which he may become a solicitor on passing the final examination. With regard to bankrupt solicitors, that subject had also recently engaged the attention of the council, and he thought that it might very well be left in their hands. The names of a large number of the solicitors who had become bankrupt did not appear in the *Law List*, and he did not think it was the wish of the society, nor would it be worth while, to stigmatize the unfortunate members of the society who have become bankrupt ["Hear, hear," from Mr. Munton], but the question might, with advantage, be discussed at Cambridge. With reference to Mr. Parker's remarks, the president said

that any suggestion of a practical character would always receive the careful attention of the council, but that his suggestion as to dividing any one examination was impracticable, inasmuch as the papers used one day for a portion of the candidates could not be used on the next for the remainder. It would thus be necessary to prepare two sets of questions, and, in fact, to have two examinations instead of one, and thus the comparative merit of the candidates could not be ascertained.

Mr. WALTER moved the following resolution:—"That the report of the council as to the call of solicitors to the bar is misleading in stating that the council has determined to introduce a Bill into Parliament on the subject, the council having introduced no such Bill."

Mr. GODFREY spoke at some length upon the steps which had been taken from time to time for obtaining an alteration of the law with reference to the call of solicitors to the bar, and remarked strongly on the inconsistency of the existing regulation of the Inns of Court under which solicitors are required to cease practice three years previous to being admitted to the bar.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we have got a little wide of the mark. A resolution was moved that that portion of the report of the council which states that they have determined to introduce a Bill into Parliament with reference to the call of solicitors to the bar is misleading. I think if he member who moved this resolution had carefully read the report he would not have made such a motion. Most of us know that there is little or no hope of a private individual being able to pass a contested Bill when even the Government find the greatest difficulty in passing their own Bills. The council, therefore, considered that their chance of success would, in a great measure, depend upon introducing a clause to that end into another Bill; and having reason to anticipate that the Bar Education and Discipline Bill would be again introduced during this session, they thought it expedient to wait till that Bill was again brought forward. It was not, however, till comparatively late in the session that the council were made aware that it would not be presented. The council then prepared the Bill in question. There was nothing deceptive in the report. The council stated they had prepared a Bill which they had determined to introduce into Parliament. The Bill had been prepared, and was at present in the hands of Lord Selborne, and he thought it would be felt that this reflection on the council was uncalled for.

The amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. C. FORD moved:—"That referring to the resolution passed at the last annual general meeting in regard to the rules of the Inns of Court as affecting the call of solicitors to the bar, this meeting requests the continued attention of the council of the society."

The motion not having been seconded, the CHAIRMAN put the original resolution to the meeting—viz., that the report be received, approved, and entered on the minutes, which was carried.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had much pleasure in proposing that the fifth by-law of the society, as varied by the resolution of the 8th of May, 1874, be, and it is hereby, repealed, and that the fifty-second by-law be altered so as to do away with the entrance fee now payable by new members.

Mr. PROUDFOOT wished to know what good could be derived by the admission of gentlemen into the society who would not pay the entrance-fee. In 1874 the admission fee was reduced from £5 to £2 in the case of solicitors taking out town certificates, and £1 in the case of solicitors taking out country certificates, and he did not consider it possible that either town or country solicitors desirous of becoming members of the society could object to such nominal fees.

Mr. GEDGE was of opinion that the admission fee ought to be done away with, and considered that the abolition of the admission fee would be a financial benefit to the society, referring to the case of the London Library, where a similar course was adopted with a successful result.

Mr. STEINBERG said he remembered the time when the admission fee was £15, and he considered it unfair that members who paid no admission fee should be entitled to the same privileges as those who had paid the fee.

Mr. COLLETTE thought that, as the account showed there was a surplus fund, arrangements ought to be made for the amalgamation of the hall and club and for providing better

accommodation in the club for members than at present, but he was not going to oppose the proposed motion in any way.

Mr. BRAITHWAITE considered that the abolition of the entrance fee would deprive the present members of their status in the profession.

The CHAIRMAN said the courts only interfered with charges of certain serious offences against solicitors, and it was necessary that the society should exercise a domestic jurisdiction over its members, and the proposal for doing away with the admission fee would increase the power of the society in this respect, as then there would be no excuse for any respectable solicitor not becoming a member. He was of opinion that even upon the lower commercial element the proposal would be found to be successful, the admission fee of new members at present averaging only £380 per annum to the funds of the society.

Mr. C. FORD approved of the motion.

Mr. HETT, as a country solicitor residing 150 miles from London, was much surprised at the proposition which had come from the council, and did not believe that it would increase the number of members of the society. He was of opinion that if better arrangements were made with regard to the club (which he understood was occupied rent free) for country members, and rooms provided for them in which to meet their friends or clients, it would greatly increase the number of members.

Mr. JONES, as another country member, disapproved of the suggestion, and moved that the subject be adjourned to the next annual meeting.

The PRESIDENT reminded the meeting that this subject had been brought forward and discussed very often already, and that it was opposed to the views of the council for the time being, as it was feared that its adoption would greatly diminish the funds of the society, but that the finances of the society were now in such a state as to enable them to do it, even though it proved something of a loss. Moreover, when members of the society paid their annual visit to the larger provincial towns, the admission fee had been made a common excuse on the part of country solicitors for not joining the society.

The amendment for adjournment having been put to the meeting, it was negatived, and the original motion for the abolition of the admission fee was carried.

Mr. STEINBERG proposed, and Mr. ARNOLD seconded, "That this meeting begs to suggest to the council of this society the desirability of endeavouring to obtain the insertion in the *Law List* of the fact of any solicitor having obtained a prize or certificate of merit on passing his final examination, in the same way that studentships and certificates of honour obtained by barristers are recorded therein."

The PRESIDENT said that he was not aware that there was any regulation preventing a solicitor who had obtained a prize or certificate of merit from notifying the fact in the form supplied to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and that as the resolution was only a suggestion to the council, he was sure they would take it into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. FRASER moved "That the best thanks of the society were due to the president and the council for the care and attention they had bestowed on the interests of the profession during the past year," which was carried unanimously.

Mr. C. FORD drew attention to certain remarks made by Lord Justice Brett in February, which he quoted, and moved that some steps should be taken with reference to them.

The PRESIDENT remarked that the observations referred to appeared to have been made in reference to a particular case then before the learned judge, and not with regard to solicitors generally.

The motion was withdrawn.

Mr. C. FORD next moved, and Mr. FULLAGAR seconded, "That the right of solicitors in regard to appearing as advocates before courts of quarter sessions should be defined by the Legislature," which, after a short discussion, was adopted.

Mr. C. FORD then withdrew various other resolutions of which he had given notice, and a vote of thanks to the president for his conduct in the chair terminated the proceedings.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The annual dinner of this society was held at the St. James's-hall Restaurant, Piccadilly, on Tuesday, the 8th inst. Mr. F. K. Muntion occupied the chair.

After the usual loyal and patriotic toasts had been given with due honours, at the conclusion of the dinner, the chairman gave "The Law Students' Debating Society," and in doing so he referred to the fact that the society was formerly the only one of its kind in the solicitors' branch of the legal profession, and the example set had since been taken up by other societies. Young solicitors especially, more than any other class, required a debating society, and it was a matter for regret that the majority of solicitors were still unable to make a good speech. He was glad the society had always met at the Law Institution, which he considered the most suitable spot, and it had always received great support from that institution. In concluding, the chairman made a passing reference to some of the leading members of the bar who had formerly belonged to the society.

Mr. Groves gave the next toast, "The Bench and the Bar." Mr. S. Woe replied.

Mr. Swinfen Eady then proposed "The Incorporated Law Society," and Mr. R. F. Austen responded.

Mr. Indermaur next gave "The Chairman," which was drunk with cheers, and Mr. Muntion replied.

Mr. J. Nicholls proposed "The Officers of the Society (for the Past Session)," for whom Mr. J. Van Sommer (hon. sec.) responded.

Mr. A. M. Ellis gave "The Old Members," coupled with the name of Mr. J. Bradford, and Mr. E. C. Harvie gave "The Visitors," to which Mr. Alfred Rawlinson replied.

A few other speeches and some songs brought the evening to a close.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At a meeting held on Tuesday evening last in the Law Library, A. Canning, Esq., in the chair, a debate took place on the following moot point:—"Is a newspaper proprietor criminally as well as civilly liable for a libel published by an editor to whom he has given the entire control of the editorial department of the paper?" 6 & 7 Vict. c. 96 (Lord Campbell's Act), s. 7; *Reg. v. Holbrook* (25 W. R. 144, 47 L. J. Q. B. D. 35, L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 60, 27 W. R. 313, L. R. 4 Q. B. D. 42). The speakers on the affirmative were Messrs. Edwards, Hayes, Steere, and Taylor; on the negative, Messrs. Bayley, Freeman, O'Connor, Barrows, and Rogers. The chairman having summed up, the question was put, and decided in the negative. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting.

At the Winchester Assizes, before the Lord Chief Justice on the 11th inst., William Andrew Kilby, a solicitor, and Wilson Noble Hoare, a gentleman farmer, were indicted for a conspiracy to defraud Peter Langley, a money-lender. The jury found both the prisoners Not Guilty, and application was made to the Lord Chief Justice that the prosecutor should pay the costs of the prosecution. His lordship, however, said that though he entirely concurred in the verdict, he could not say that the prosecutor had not, if he thought fit, a legal right to take the course he had taken. He should not, therefore, make him pay the costs of the defence. He could, however, refuse a certificate to the prosecutor, who would have to bear his own costs.

At a meeting of the International Code Committee of America, held on June 6, the following were appointed delegates to the conference of the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations, to be held in London on August 11, 1879:—David Dudley Field, John Welsh United States Minister to England; Joseph P. Thompson, F. A. P. Barnard, Charles A. Peabody, S. I. Prime, A. P. Sprague, Theodore W. Dwight, James Emmott, E. C. Benedict, John F. Dillon, Amasa J. Parker, Howard P. Wilds, Johnson T. Platt, J. A. Fulton, E. A. Washburn, Archibald Alexander, and Fisher A. Baker. The subjects proposed for discussion by the American delegates at the conference are the following:—Protection and neutrality of the projected canal across the Isthmus of Darien; protection of international telegraphs; consular jurisdiction in Oriental countries; collisions at sea; international regulations for lighthouse, sea signals, and quarantines; extradition of criminals; uniform weights, measures, and coinage.

Obituary.

MR. JAMES MARCY.

Mr. James Marcy, solicitor, died at his residence, at Wellington, Shropshire, on the 23rd ult., after a short but painful illness. Mr. Marcy was the fourth son of the late Mr. George Marcy, solicitor, of Wellington, and he was born in 1851. He was admitted a solicitor in 1874, and was soon afterwards appointed clerk to the Wellington Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, and Rural Sanitary Authority, in the place of his father, upon whose death, in 1877, he became Superintendent Registrar, and clerk to the Wrekin District Highway Board, and the High Ereal School Board. He was also joint clerk (with Mr. Robert Daniel Nawill) to the Wellington Improvement Commissioners. Mr. Marcy's early death has caused much regret, he having been married only a few months ago. He was buried on the 2nd inst. in the family vault in Wellington churchyard, the funeral being attended by a large number of professional and private friends.

MR. HENRY DALE.

Mr. Henry Dale, solicitor, of North Shields and Sunderland, died at his residence, Preston House, North Shields, on the 30th ult. Mr. Dale was the son of the late Mr. Henry Dale, solicitor, of North Shields, where he was born in 1821. He was admitted a solicitor in 1848, and was formerly in partnership with his father and with Mr. Shallett John Dale, but more recently he had carried on business alone, having offices at Sunderland as well as at North Shields. His firm were for several years joint clerks to the magistrates of the borough of North Shields, and since the dissolution of his partnership with Mr. S. J. Dale the deceased had held the office alone. Mr. H. Dale had a good private practice.

MR. JOHN HARWARD.

Mr. John Harward, solicitor (the head of the firm of Harward, Shepherd, and Mills), died recently at Stourbridge. Mr. Harward was admitted solicitor in 1838, and was formerly associated with Mr. William Hunt and Mr. Rowland Price, but had been for several years in partnership with Mr. Gainsborough Harward, Mr. John Bullen Shepherd, and Mr. Harry Mills. He was a commissioner to administer oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature, and a perpetual commissioner for Worcestershire, and he held several important public appointments, being clerk to the county magistrates, to the Stourbridge Canal Company, and to the deputy-lieutenancy for Worcestershire, and steward of the Manor of Church, Clint. He was formerly judge of the ancient Manorial Court at Stourbridge, and had been registrar of the Stourbridge County Court (Circuit No. 23) ever since the passing of the County Courts Act, 1846. He was also for some time clerk to the Stourbridge Improvement Commissioners, and to the Stourbridge and Bromsgrove Turnpike Trust. Mr. Harward discharged all his important public duties with great ability and courtesy. He was an active supporter of the scheme for securing railway communication for the town, and was solicitor to the Stourbridge Railway Company. On taking his seat at the Stourbridge County Court, on Thursday, the 3rd inst., Mr. Rupert Kettle paid the following tribute to Mr. Harward's memory:—"Mr. Harward was the last judge of the ancient Manorial Court, upon the foundations of which this county court was established, and ever since its reconstruction, now nearly thirty-three years ago, he had faithfully and most efficiently discharged the duties of registrar. I had the honour of his intimate friendship many years before I sat on this bench. My knowledge, not only of his actions, but of his principles, created in me the most profound respect for him. The grave has closed so recently over John Harward that we cannot yet fully realize all the consequences of his death. We suffer now from a sudden shock; hereafter we shall deeply feel a sense of deprivation. We have been accustomed to rely upon him, to trust in his help. He knew so much, and knew it so well; he was so kind and so sagacious that the vacancy he has left amongst us will never be entirely filled. His successor may, and we trust will, be a sound lawyer and a courteous, painstaking officer. The public

business of the court will go on as heretofore, but for many a day we shall miss from his accustomed place the familiar friend we always saw with so much pleasure. It is not, as an officer of the court, that Mr. Harward will be most regretted, or his memory most revered. His whole life was a continuous career of public duty. His intense love of right, and his comprehensive charity, led him to pursue with zeal every good work he could bring within the range of his extensive influence. This is not the place in which acknowledgments should be made of Mr. Harward's abundant private charities, or of his large and consistent efforts to eradicate the vices and promote the spiritual welfare of the mass of the poor and the ignorant people who inhabit this great mining and manufacturing district. I can, however, with confidence ask you to remember the many material benefits he, with so much ability and constancy of purpose, either promoted or obtained for your town and neighbourhood. Trade owes to his exertions the development of the railway system by which your neighbourhood has so much benefited, and agriculture owes him obligations for the care he has devoted and the money he has spent in improving the quality of our cattle. Turn on which side you will, you see some of the work of his fertile and benevolent mind, of his vigorous will, and of his strong and steady hand. His characteristics were steadfast adherence under all circumstances and at all sacrifices to right; and this, with a tranquil personal bearing, which at once indicated the courteous and kindly gentleman. Let us assure his sorrowing widow, and those at home he loved so well, that, first memory and then tradition will, for many years to come, associate his name with the ideal of public service and private worth."

MR. W. H. ASHURST.

We regret to announce the death of Mr. W. H. Ashurst, the solicitor to the Post-office. Mr. Ashurst was admitted in 1843, and for nearly twenty years practised as a member of the eminent City firm founded by his father. In October, 1862, the solicitorship to the Post-office became vacant upon the death of Mr. Peacock. Mr. Ashurst's claims to the office were supported by high testimonials, but they were probably, in no small degree, strengthened by the recollection of the services of his late father, twenty-three years before, to the cause of post-office reform. However this may have been, Mr. Ashurst speedily justified the selection; for he gave himself up to the work of the office with great energy. His efficiency as a public officer, and his character as a man, can hardly be better described than they have been by the pen of one who knew him well, who, writing in the *Daily News*, says:—"It fell to him, in addition to its ordinary duties, to do much laborious and anxious work in connection with the establishment of the telegraphic system and the important legislation, negotiations, and arrangements it involved. In all this work he exhibited great ability, combined with urbanity of manner, which made him popular with his professional brethren even when he was opposed to them. Notwithstanding these important engagements connected with his office, he was ever ready to lend a helping hand towards the forwarding of all movements connected with popular progress and philanthropic objects. He was, among other things, an active member of the British and Continental Federation for the Suppression of State Regulated Vice, and his perfect knowledge of the French language enabled him to render exceptional services at the Congress summoned by that body nearly two years ago at Geneva. His eminently social qualities endeared him to a very large circle of friends, and his loss is felt as that of one who was true and steadfast, and above reproach."

Appointments, &c.

Mr. JOHN BREWSTER, jun., solicitor and notary, of Middlesbrough, has been appointed Clerk to the County Magistrates at Middlesbrough, on the resignation of his father, Mr. John Brewster, sen. Mr. Brewster, jun., was admitted a solicitor in 1875.

Mr. HENRY FORD, solicitor, of Portsea, Portsmouth, and Fareham, has been elected Clerk of the Peace for the Borough of Portsmouth, in succession to Mr. John Howard, deceased.

Mr. Ford was admitted a solicitor in 1840, and is in partnership with Mr. William Henry Ford. He is solicitor to the Licensed Victuallers' Association, the Builders' Protection Association, and Conservative agent for the district, and he was till recently one of the aldermen of the borough of Portsmouth.

Mr. HARRY FRECKELTON GADSBY, solicitor, of Derby, has been elected Town Clerk and Registrar of the Court of Record of that borough, on the resignation of his father, Mr. John Gadsby, who retains the office of clerk of the peace for the borough. Mr. H. F. Gadsby was admitted a solicitor in 1876.

Mr. NATHANIEL TERTIUS LAWRENCE, solicitor (of the firm of Domville, Lawrence, Graham, & Long), vice-president of the Incorporated Law Society, has been elected President of the Society for the ensuing year. Mr. Lawrence was admitted a solicitor in 1848, and is a director of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association.

Mr. RUSSELL LOUIS RICCARD, solicitor, South Molton, Devon (admitted 1867), has been elected Town Clerk, Clerk to the Urban Sanitary Authority, and Clerk of the Peace for the Borough of South Molton, in succession to his father, the late Mr. Russell Martyn Riccard. Mr. R. L. Riccard has also been appointed Clerk to the Commissioners of Property and Income Tax.

Mr. CHARLES SMITH, solicitor, of Romford and Ongar, has been elected Clerk to the Ongar Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, and Rural Sanitary Authority. Mr. Smith was admitted a solicitor in 1864, and is also clerk to the Magistrates and the Commissioners of Taxes at Ongar, and to the Dagenham School Board, Essex.

Mr. WILLIAM JAMES TASMAN, solicitor (of the firm of Cordwell and Tasman), of 2, Serjeant's-inn, Chancery-lane, and Forest-hill, has been appointed Assistant Clerk to the Saddlers' Company. Mr. Tasman was admitted a solicitor in Hilary Term, 1871.

DISSOLUTIONS OF PARTNERSHIP.

ALBERT EDMUND LOUGHBOROUGH and HUBERT BILLINGHURST KNIGHT (Loughborough & Knight) solicitors, 23, Austin Friars, London. June 30. (*Gazette*, July 11.)

FREDERICK GEORGE CORDWELL and WILLIAM JAMES TASMAN, solicitors, 2, Serjeant's-inn, Chancery-lane, London (Cordwell & Tasman), (business carried on by F. G. Cordwell. July 9. (*Gazette*, July 15.)

JOHN MAY, J. FRED. MAY, P. PARROTT, solicitors, Macclesfield (Parrott, May, & Sons). June 30. (*Gazette*, July 15.)

Legal News.

An American legal contemporary has discovered the source of the line in "Pinafore," "And so do his sisters, and his cousins, and his aunts," in Blackstone's chapter on Coparcenary.

The case of *Heard v. Russell* (59 Georgia, 25) was, says the *Albany Law Journal*, a case respecting a cotton speculation on "margins." After pointing out an example of a valid contract for future delivery, the circuit judge held forth to the jury after this fashion:—"But now comes in this counterfeit—this imitation. The decision of Parker was good in the case of a genuine transaction, which is fair and legal. It comes a fellow who wants to make a contract for future delivery, saying: 'I'll make a spec on this business.' His business is not legitimate. He is the counterfeit of the honest dealer or contractor. . . . But it sometimes is said that the business is governed by rules. So is 'seven-up' governed by rules. A jack can take a ten, a king a queen, and an ace can take a king. It has been called disreputable; there are marked cards; some fellows can deal a trump whenever they want to. So has 'draw-poker' rules, like as gambling in futures has rules. They say this future business is fair. So is 'seven-up' if a fellow deals fair hands. I think the paste-board gambling is the best of the two. In 'futures,' a man puts up his 5,000dols., or 10,000dols., or more, and when it is gone he is led along to put up more 'to keep his margin good.' When he can go no further, he can be closed out. In

paste-board gambling, it only takes the pile a man has up; but in this future gambling they keep calling on their victim to 'keep up his margin,' until he is squeezed as dry as a lemon. . . . It always seems a one-sided, jugg-handled sort of business. It's always more margin, more conus. It is to the interest of the State and the people of Georgia to prevent all this kind of Wall-street gambling."

"Bedford Row" writes to the *Times*:—"The long vacation is nearly upon us, again bringing with it the rest that is due and necessary to the staff of many of the legal offices. There is, however, one body of gentlemen who do not, I think, find the 8th of August brings such a complete change to the routine of their daily lives. I refer to the chancery taxing masters. While no one will deny their ability, no one, I think, will assert that they allow themselves to overstep the limits of moderate work, and it is difficult to understand why it should be necessary that their offices should be closed for three months in the autumn of each year. It is of the greatest inconvenience to the public and to the profession that it should be so, and it is also a waste of public time and money. It must be remembered that this is not the only relaxation the law offices enjoy during the year. I think I am right in putting the holidays at the taxing offices at nearly one-third of the year, and the hours of attendance of the masters at eleven to four each day. Their work is simple during this time, and their remuneration varies from £1,500 a year in the case of the more recent appointments to £2,000 a year in the case of the older ones. If the long vacation could be utilized for the taxation of bills of costs, it would leave solicitors freer to attend to other matters when the courts are sitting, and which can only be attended to then. As it is, things have now often to be neglected in order that a heavy bill of costs may be disposed of before the long vacation, and delay is always laid at our doors. No client ever yet believed that any one but 'the lawyers' was responsible for delay. To suitors the speedy taxation of a bill of costs is often of great importance, as, where there is a fund in court, it cannot usually be distributed until the costs are ascertained and paid. Some alteration is plainly necessary, and I cannot see why these gentlemen, so easily worked and so well paid, should be indulged with more than the moderate summer holiday with which most working men have to be content."

CORONERS.

THE following special report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Coroners Bill has been issued:—"Your committee in going through the Bill have framed their amendments on the assumption that the office of coroner is not to be abolished or merged in any other jurisdiction. They have taken some evidence as to the working of the Scotch system of dealing with those cases which in England come under the cognizance of the coroner. As in Scotland there is an elaborate machinery maintained at the cost of the State for the investigation and prosecution of crime, and as in England and Wales such a system can hardly be said to be in operation while the cost of the coroner's inquisition falls on the rates, it has not seemed to your committee expedient to inquire into the desirability of assimilating the English practice to that of Scotland. They are, however, of opinion that valuable suggestions as regards the medical investigation into the cause of death may be derived from the Scotch system; and since the Bill as amended by your committee exacts a legal qualification for the office of coroner, it becomes important to make some improved provision for a satisfactory medical investigation in all cases in which an inquest is or may be necessary. With this view your committee recommend that the coroner should, where practicable, nominate one or more competent medical men, to be approved by the Secretary of State, to act within his district; and that in all cases in which notice is given to the coroner of a death which calls or may call for an inquest, such notice should be accompanied or be closely followed by the report of the medical men or of one of the medical men so nominated. Your committee further recommend that for the purpose of insuring that *post mortem* examinations or other medical investigations which may be requisite for the purposes of an inquest should be conducted efficiently, the coroner for each district should nominate

one or more competent medical men, to be approved as aforesaid (being either the same as those nominated for the purpose of making the said report to the coroner or others), by one of whom in all cases the requisite *post mortem* examination should be made, unless the coroner, with the approval of the Secretary of State, should in any particular case otherwise order. Your committee consider that the double investigation which now takes place before the coroner and the magistrates in cases where a person is accused of a crime in relation to a death upon which an inquest has been held is a cause of needless expense and inconvenience, and they are of opinion that though it may not be feasible to avoid it in all cases, yet that if a system of efficient salaried legal coroners were established throughout the country it might be possible to confer upon them the powers of a stipendiary magistrate, and thus obviate the evils referred to. To carry this out, it would no doubt be requisite to consolidate the areas of many coroners' districts."

County Courts.

LEEDS.

(Before W. T. S. DANIEL, Esq., Q.C., Judge.)

June 11.—*Re Eli Mathers & Sons, Ex parte Close.*

In this case cross-motions were brought for the purpose of deciding in effect whether certain machinery of the debtors, upon their premises at Larkfield Mills, Rawdon, should go to the landlord or to the creditors. The debtors held a lease of rooms and steam power, and the machinery in question had been fixed by the tenants to the freehold for the purpose of working. It remained so fixed at the time of the filing of the petition for liquidation, but was severed at the instance of the debtors and Mr. J. W. Close, the receiver, from the steam power provided by the landlord, prior to any resolution in liquidation being come to, the first meeting of creditors having been twice adjourned to allow of this being done, and a special order of the court having been obtained authorizing the severance.

West appeared for the landlord; and

Walker (solicitor) for the trustees in liquidation.

HIS HONOUR, in giving judgment, said that since last court he had had an opportunity of considering this case. He had come to the conclusion that, as he viewed the matter, the case was really free from all substantial difficulty. The real question in dispute was whether or not the landlord, Mr. Thompson, was entitled, under the arrangements that had been made for a new tenancy, to treat as belonging to him the machinery which had been and was at the time the petition for liquidation was presented affixed to the freehold—whether he could claim the value of the machinery as his property as being part of his freehold. The fixtures in question consisted of machinery, and were trade fixtures. The lease was of the usual description, which was familiar in this district, and he might say throughout Lancashire and Yorkshire. The lease was of room and power, and the rent reserved was for room and power. The landlord found the room, and he also undertook to find the power. Without the tenant's machinery being brought in upon the premises, and applied in the way in which the tenant's necessities for trade purposes required, the mill and the landlord's machinery would be of no value whatever to the tenant. The machines were brought there to occupy the room in order that the power might be applied in such a way as to enable the tenant to derive profit by the use of these in his trade, and the machinery so brought by the tenant unquestionably was property intended to be used by him for trade purposes, and it was connected with the freehold so as to enable it to receive that power which the landlord undertook to supply. Now, in ordinary circumstances, ever since the time of Henry VII., the right of the tenant to remove trade fixtures during his term had been an undisputed right, and no one could dispute that, if, before the petition for liquidation had been filed, the lessee intending to file it, or intending to give up carrying on his business, had disannexed these machines from the freehold, the landlord would have had no right to complain. The question he had revolved in his mind was this: Does the presentation of a petition for liquidation in any manner diminish the rights which the lessee would have as against the landlord to disannex? The petition for liquidation could not according to his view, dispossess the tenant of his

right under the lease. He still remained owner of the estate, and the only effect of his presenting his petition for liquidation, and, therefore, committing an act of bankruptcy, was that he was restrained from disposing of his estate in any manner prejudicial to the interests of his creditors. What was done in this case was that a receiver was appointed. The effect of appointing a receiver was that he took possession of the property of the debtor, but for what purpose? For the purpose of protecting the property against any misapplication of that property to the prejudice of the creditors; but he did not take possession of that property for the purpose of defeating any right which the tenant would be entitled to exercise for the benefit of his creditors as against the landlord. It was not intended that the receiver was to act in the interest of the landlord and against the interest of the creditors. At the first meeting of creditors, instead of coming to any resolution, the meeting was adjourned in order to enable the tenant to disannex the machinery. The tenant, acting with the concurrence of the receiver—acting at the instance of the creditors, and, as it seemed to him, acting in an interest which, as against the landlord, he was entitled to exercise—attempted to disannex the machinery. The landlord interfered, and resisted the disannexing. In his opinion the tenant was exercising a lawful right, in which he was disturbed by the landlord unlawfully, and being resisted, the tenant ceased his disannexing. The question must rest entirely upon the right of the tenant to disannex during his term the machines in question. They were confessedly trade machines, and he conceived that he had that right. The debtor desired to act within the limits of the law, and the receiver applied to that court for an order that he might have the liberty to disannex. That order was made by the registrar, acting under the authority delegated to him by him (the judge), and the order was made *ex parte*. Complaint had been made that the order was made *ex parte*. He did not know how else the order could be made. Nobody else had to do with the question but the court and the creditors, acting through the receiver, and the tenant. The landlord had no right to say, "You shan't disannex," therefore it seemed to him that the order was properly made *ex parte*. It was complained that the order was made against good faith. He had looked carefully through the affidavits, and could not make out that there was anything to prevent the receiver taking any steps without communicating with the landlord. As regarded the landlord and the receiver, they were at arm's length, and the receiver was fully entitled to apply to this court for the order, and the order was framed as carefully as it could be. It contained an order that the machinery should not be removed from the premises, and was without prejudice to the rights of the landlord. He was asked to discharge that order, but he had no jurisdiction in the matter. It was an order by the registrar acting for him, and any appeal must be an appeal to the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy. He was of opinion that in this case the disannexing of the machinery took place and was completed before the trustee was appointed, and that the transactions which had taken place since had amounted to a re-letting by the landlord with the consent of the trustee, which amounted in law to a surrender of the former interest in the tenant, and that the rights of the tenant up to the time of the trustee assenting to the new arrangement would not be in any manner prejudiced by the arrangements that had been come to. He dismissed the landlord's motion, and with regard to the trustee's motion declared that the sum of £488, or whatever it was, formed part of the estate of the debtor. Costs were given on one motion.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

JULY 10.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT. ENCLOSURE PROVISIONAL ORDER (WHITTINGTON COMMON).

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (passed through Committee).

BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (Sevenoaks Railway Purchase).

JULY 14.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.
PRIVATE BILLS.—East Indian Railway, Liverpool Lighting.

MARRIAGES (HER MAJESTY'S SHIPS).
BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Manchester Suburban Tramways, Rotherham Borough, Downham and Stoke Ferry Railway, St. Helen's and District Tramways, Birkenhead Tramway.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT (passed through Committee). CIVIL PROCEDURE ACTS REPEAL (passed through Committee).

JULY 15.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

HIGHWAYS ACCOUNTS.
BILL IN COMMITTEE.

MARRIAGES CONFIRMATION (HER MAJESTY'S SHIPS).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Thames River (Prevention of Floods).
SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT. CIVIL PROCEDURE ACTS REPEAL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

JULY 10.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (OFFICERS).

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses 166—180).

SLAVE TRADE (EAST AFRICAN COURTS) (passed through Committee). CHILDREN'S DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES (passed through Committee).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—East and West India Dock Company, Trefrig Valley Railway, Upper Mersey Navigation.

JULY 11.—BILL IN COMMITTEE.

NEW FOREST ACT AMENDMENT (passed through Committee).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Sharpness New Docks, Gloucester and Birmingham Navigation Company.

SLAVE TRADE (EAST AFRICAN COURTS).

JULY 14.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE.

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses [postponed before] 69—72 and new clauses). INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (passed through Committee).

JULY 15.—BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (passed through Committee). COMMONS ACTS AMENDMENT (passed through Committee).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Croesor and Porthmadoc Railway.

CHILDREN'S DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES.

JULY 16.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Ardmillan Reclamation.

KNIGHTSBRIDGE AND OTHER CROWN LANDS.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. COMMONS ACTS AMENDMENT.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

JOINT-STOCK BANK (ACCOUNTS). ANIMAL VACCINATION.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (DISTRICT COURTS).

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	V.C. MALINS.
Monday, July 21	Mr. Latham	Mr. King	Mr. Kee
Tuesday	32 Leach	Merivale	Clowes
Wednesday	23 Latham	King	Kee
Thursday	24 Leach	Merivale	Clowes
Friday	25 Latham	King	Kee
Saturday	26 Leach	Merivale	Clowes
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice Fay.
Monday, July 21	Mr. Farrer	Mr. Cobby	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday	22 Teesdale	Jackson	Ward
Wednesday	23 Farrer	Cobby	Pemberton
Thursday	24 Teesdale	Jackson	Ward
Friday	25 Farrer	Cobby	Pemberton
Saturday	26 Teesdale	Jackson	Ward

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

- July 21.—Mr. S. WALKER, at the Mar, at 2 p.m., leasehold property (see advertisement, June 28, p. 6).
- July 22.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold and leasehold properties (see advertisement, June 14, pp. 12 and 13).
- July 22.—Mr. WALTER KNIGHT, at the Mason's Hall Tavern, at 1 p.m., leasehold property (see advertisement, this week, p. 6).
- July 22.—Messrs. PHILLIP D. TUCKETT & Co., at the Mart, at 1 p.m., freehold property (see advertisement, July 12, p. 4).
- July 23.—Messrs. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold and leasehold properties (see advertisement, July 5, p. 6).
- July 23.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold and leasehold properties, reversionary interest, and shares (see advertisement, July 5, p. 5, and this week, p. 6).
- July 23.—Mr. TAYLOR, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold property (see advertisement, July 5, p. 5).
- July 25.—Messrs. NORTON, TRIST, WATNEY, & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold property (see advertisement, this week, p. 6).
- July 26.—Messrs. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & Co., at the Raven Hotel, Shrewsbury, freehold property (see advertisement, July 5, p. 6).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

- CROFT.—July 11, at 23, Royal-crescent, Notting-hill, the wife of Henry Herbert Stephen Croft, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
- CROSS.—July 12, at Prescott, the wife of Henry Cross, solicitor, of a son.
- GWYNN.—July 9, at 35, Cornwallis-crescent, Clifton, the wife of H. F. M. C. Gwynn, solicitor, of a son.
- ODGERS.—July 9, at Saville House, Fitzjohn's-avenue, Hampstead, N.W., the wife of W. Blake Odgers, barrister-at-law, of a son.

DEATHS.

- ASHURST.—July 14, at No. 7, Prince of Wales's-terrace, Kensington, William Henry Ashurst, Solicitor to the Post Office, aged 59.
- CLARKE.—July 10, at 8, York-gate, Regent's Park, Francis William Clarke, Esq. of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, aged 54.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.
FRIDAY, July 11, 1879.

- General Investment Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 4, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on July 19.
- Blagden, Fenchurch avenue, Lime st, solicitor for the petitioner.
- Jimnan Steam Shipping Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 7, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on July 19.
- Bradley, Mark lane, solicitor for the petitioners.
- Metropolitan Bank, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 9, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on July 19.
- Harper and Co, Rood lane, solicitors for the petitioner.
- Paris Hansom Cab Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 9, directed to be heard before the M.R., on July 19.
- Muskerrey-Tilson, Bishopsgate st, solicitor for the petitioner.
- Scotthill Wood Pleasure Ground Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated July 5, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Layton and J. ques. Ely pl, Holborn, agents for Southfield and Taylor, Bailey, solicitors for the petitioner.
- LIMITED IN CHANCERY.
TUESDAY, July 15, 1879.
- Cole Harbour Land Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated July 5, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Brandon, Essex st, petitioners in per o.
- Commercial Mills, Oswaldtwistle, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated July 5, it was ordered that the above mills be wound up. Marsland, St. Swithin's lane, agent for Adleshaw and Warburton, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner.
- Debenture Bond and Mortgage Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, by an order dated July 5, appointed Mr. James Cooper, Coleman st buildings, to be official liquidator.
- Hempstead and Company, Phoenix Iron and Crack Works, Grantham, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 12, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on July 25. Gole, L. me st, solicitor for the petitioners.
- Jackson, Gill, and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 10, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 26.
- Linklater and Co, Walbrook.
- Jackson, Gill, and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 14, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 26.
- Van Sandau and Cumming, King st, Cheap-side, agents for Belk and Partridge, Middle-borough, solicitors for the petitioner.
- Newhill and Milton Main Coal Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated July 5, it was ordered that the voluntary winding

up of the above company be continued. Ridsdale and Co, Gray's-inn square, agents for Nicholson and Co, Walth-upon-Dearne, solicitors for the petitioner.

Patent Cocoa Fibre Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before July 26, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to John Ball, Gresham building, Bank-lane, at Friday, August 1, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudication upon the debts and claims.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1879.

West Roskear Mining Company.—By an order made by the Vice-Warden, dated July 8, it was ordered the above company be wound up. Hodge and Co, Truro, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, July 11, 1879.

London Mutual Benefit Society, Goswell rd. July 8

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, July 11, 1879.

- Alten, Percy Hollingworth, Colombo, Ceylon. Nov 1. Burrows.
- Richards, V.C. Hall. Miller, Gracechurch st.
- Brown, Thoma, Uppingham, 8. lictor. Aug 6. Dixon v. Brown, V.C. Hall. Phillips, Stamford.
- Edmunds, Joeses Watson, Bramston, Northampton. Sept 1. Edmunds v. Edmunds, V.C. Hall. Barton and Wiloughby, D. ventry.
- Edmunds, John, Turpin, Northampton, Farmer. Sept 1. Edmunds v. Edmunds, V.C. Hall. Barton and Wiloughby, D. ventry.
- Hepper, Joseph Henry, Leeds, Auctioneer. July 25. Hepper v. Hepper, V.C. Bacon. North, Leeds.
- Holland, William, Deptford, Distiller. Sept 1. Holland v. Holland, M.R. Marchant, G.orge yard, Lombard st.
- Mason, George, Killybegh, Lancashire, Yeoman. Aug 8. Atkin-
- son v. Dixon, M.R. Hall, Broughton-in-Furness.
- Mellor, Thomas, Thongsbridge, York, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer.
- Oct 1. Mellor v. Taylor, V.C. Bacon. Hall, Huddersfield.
- Phillips, Hugh, Forest, Hloxan, Cornwall, Yeoman. July 25. Vivian v. Phillips, Fry, J. Cook, Truro.
- Pickardite, George James, Eagle Wharf rd, City rd, Glass Bottle Manufacturer. Aug 5. Pickardite v. Pickardite, V.C. Hall. Mason, North bldgs, Eidon st, Finsbury.
- Pottinger, Charles, Knottingley, York, Army Sergeant. Aug 1. Shields v. Dobson, V.C. Bacon. Arandell, Pontefract.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1879.

- Eames, William, Steep, South-umpton, Yeoman. Aug 11. Carter v. Read, M.R. A. bery, Midhurst.
- Jennett, Ann, Upper Tulse Hill. July 31. Miller v. Miller, V.C. Hall.
- Miller and Son, King st, St James' sq, Westminster.
- Robinson, Thomas, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Draper. Sept 1. Walter v. Robinson, M.R. Griffith, Newcastle-under-Lyme.
- Williams, Sir Frederick Martin, Gooonrea, Cornwall, Bart, Banker. Aug 30. Hussey v. Williams, M.R. Smith and Paul, Truro.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Viet. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, July 4, 1879.

- Allies, William Thomas, Alford, Lincoln, Soda Water Manufacturer. July 25. Wise, Boston.
- Bailey, John, Jun., Mount st, Berkeley sq, Poulterers. Aug 1. Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st, Bond st.
- Beaumont, John Edwin, Wortley, York, Farmer. Oct 1. Temper-
- Leeds.
- Birch, Mary Amelia, Seaton, Devon. August 1. Bennett, Bruton.
- Bowker, Samuel, Aston-by-Budworth, Chester, Farmer. Aug 9.
- Fletcher, Northwich.
- Branley, John, Wildmore Fen, Lincoln, Esq. July 25. Wise, Bos-
- ton.
- Butler, Thomas, Batcombe, Somerset, Yeoman. Aug 1. Bennett, Bruton.
- Cave, the Hon. Maria Otway, Stanford Hall, Leicester. Sept 1. Bull and Co, Bedford row.
- Cole, Ralph, Plymouth, Esq. Sept 1. Whiteford and Bennett, Ply-
- mouth.
- Collett, Henry Strathford, Inkerman rd, Kentish Town, Licensed Victualler. Aug 3. Clark and Chapman, Walbrook, Mansion House Octave (and not Octavius, as erroneously printed in Gazette of 2nd Aug.), Austin Davidson, Myfield rd, Dalston, Barrister-at-law. Aug 1. Carr and Co, Basinghall st.
- Denning, James Wyatt, Belham, Somerset, Yeoman. July 31. Can-
- ning and Kyrie, Chard.
- Elliott, Reynolds John, Huddersfield, Cigar Manufacturer. Sept 1.
- Mosely, Huddersfield.
- Ellis, James, Beverley, York, Gent. Sept 1. Baanton, Beverley.
- Evans, Edward, Leominster, Hereford, Grocer. Sept 1. Robinson, Leominster.
- Farmer, John, Princes rd, Kennington Cross, Cab Proprietor. Aug 1.
- Draper, Vincent sq.
- Fernley, Nancy, Mouram, Chester. July 31. Smith, Hyde-lane, Hyde.
- Garbett, the Venerable Archdeacon James, Clayton Rectory, Brighton. Aug 1. Waugh, Cuckfield.
- Green, Hannah, Hunslow, Licensed Victualler. Aug 3. Grant, Kennington Cross.
- Harding, John, Batcombe, Somerset, Gent. August 1. Bennett, Bruton.
- Hookins, Elisabeth Charlotte, Haslebury, Plucknett, Somerset. Aug 2. Sparks and Blake, Crewkerne.
- Jones, John, Brynadael, Merioneth, Solicitor. Aug 8. Griffiths and Sons, Dolgellay.
- Kirkham, James Bradley, Brigg, Lincoln, Farmer. July 24. Robb-
- and Sower, Brigg.
- Llewellyn, John, Saundersfoot, Pembroke, Innkeeper. Aug 16. Lock, Tenby.
- Louttit, Mary Aughton, Sunderland. Aug 11. Pinkney, Sander-
- land.

McQuade, George, Liverpool, General Dealer. Aug 1. Bromber and Co, Liverpool
 Morris, Arthur, Tashworth, Stafford, Gent. Aug 23. Johnson and Co, Birmingham
 Nicholas, Rose Hannah Blake, Dale End, Birmingham. Aug 1. Ryland and Co, Birmingham
 Parker, Thomas Gomborne, Browholme Hall, York, Esq. Aug 1. Wodwell and Parker, Selby
 Price, William, Bramley, Surrey, Major-General in H.M.'s Indian Army. Aug 15. Phillips, Old Jewry-chambers
 Pratt, John, Storey st, Mile End, Old Town, Publican. Aug 5. Francis and Francis, Cambridge
 Pratt, Martha, Cuckfield, Sussex. Aug 1. Waugh, Cuckfield
 Raymond, Thomas, Devizes, Wilts. July 25. Marshall, Devizes
 Robinson, Jane, Henley-on-Thames. Aug 31. Laws, Church-court, Clement's-lane
 Steel, Francis, Derwent Bank, Cumberland. Aug 1. Waugh, Cuckfield
 Semmerfield, John, Betchton, Chester, Gent. July 31. Remer, Sandbach
 Tate, Mary, Bishop Wilton, York. Aug 21. Eldridge and Stephenson, Hull
 Walton, James, Clarendon gardens, Maida Hill, Gent. Aug 8. Aldridge and Co, Bedford-row
 Watson, Anna Maria, Warkworth, Northumberland. Aug 23. Alderson and Co, Eokington
 Wate n, Margaret, Warkworth, Northumberland. Aug 23. Alderson and Co, Eokington
 White, Robert, Kingston-upon-Hull, Rullyman. Aug 21. Eldridge and Stephenson
 Wood, George, Otley, York, Esq. Aug 1. Gardiner and Jefferey, Bradford
 Yates, Edward, Warwick rd, Paddington, Esq. Aug 15. Stokes, Chancery-lane

TUESDAY, July 8, 1879.

Abbott, Benjamin, Lupas st, Pimlico, Auctioneer. Aug 14. Christman, Walbrook
 Agnew, Henry, Blackburn, Innkeeper. July 29. Backhouse, Blackburn
 Anstia, Ann Elizabeth Bedford, Gravesend, Kent. Sept 1. Shepherd and son, Finsbury-circus
 Banks, Eliza, Longsight, Manchester. Aug 13. Storer, Manchester
 Bower, George, Tokenhouse-yard, Gent. Sept 1. Dingwell, Tokenhouse-yard
 Bubby, Maria, Lewisham, Kent. Aug 1. Sandom and Co, Gracechurch st
 Carpenter, William, Colworth, Sussex, Gent. Sept 1. Arnold, Colchester
 Clark, Caudel, Heigham, Norwich, Gent. Aug 23. Whites and Co, Wyndonham
 Cox, John, Meadlands, Gloucester, Farmer. August 4. Scott, Berkeley
 Davison, Matthew William, Gainford, Durham, Spirit Merchant. Aug 16. Raine, Darlington
 Demine, William, Skipton, York, Tailor. July 21. Robinson, Skipton
 Farham, Edward Basil, Quorndon House, Leicester, Esq. Sept 29. Berridge and Morris, Leicester
 Fitzwilliam, The Hon. Alice Louisa Wentworth, Milton, Northampton. Aug 30. White and Co, St Mariborough st, Middlesex
 Free, Chester James, King's rd, Chelsea, Upholsterer. Aug 14. Christman, Walbrook
 Hare, Vere, Taunton, House Agent. August 13. Channing, Taunton
 Hollings, Richard Neville, Warwick-sq, Esq. Oct 10. Few and Co, Surrey st Strand
 Hollingsworth, Cecilia, Brunswick sq, Camberwell. Aug 20. Spence and Co, Hertford
 Holmes, Catherine, Aston-juxta-Birmingham. Aug 1. Powell, Derby
 Hutton, William, Bolton, Lancaster, Gent. Aug 2. Ryley and Haslam, Bolton
 Jarvis, Ann, Markfield, Leicester. Sept 29. Berridge and Morris, Leicester
 Jealins, Anne, Ennis rd, Finsbury Park. Aug 6. Greenhill and Bean, Gracechurch st
 Jenkins, Thomas, Finsbury Park villas, Stoke Newington. Aug 6. Greenhill and Bean, Gracechurch st
 Kutter, William, Bradford, York, Merchant. Sept 1. Terry and Robinson, Bradford
 Lane, Rev. Charles, Wrotham, Kent. Aug 16. Wads and yall, St. Helen's place
 Mason, John, Upper Kennington lane, Esq. Aug 11. Saffery and Huntley, Tooley st, London Bridge
 May, Edwin Frederick, Gt George st, Westminster, House Porter. Aug 11. Lee and Graham, Lincoln's-inn-fields
 Morgate, William, Norwich, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Aug 7. Emerson, Norwich
 O'Brien, Emma Eliza, Hill st, Knightsbridge. Aug 1. Strangeways, Theobald's rd
 Oliver, Sarah Eliza, Manchester. Aug 4. Slater and Co, Manchester
 Rees, William Pepperil, Westgate, Cornwall, Cabinet Maker. Aug 9. White and Dingley, Lauceston
 Rees, Mary, Bolton, Lancaster. Oct 5. Whitaker, Lancaster place, Stand
 Simmons, William, Henley-on-Thames, Estate Agent. Sept 19. Mercer, Henley-on-Thames
 Symonds, Stephen, Handforth, Chester, Esq. Aug 9. Symonds, Manchester
 Waterhouse, John, Halifax, Esq. Sept 1. Emmet and Walker, Halifax
 Webster, John, Cheyne rd, Chelsea, Cheesemonger. Sept 7. Robinson and Co, Charterhouse sq
 Williams, Edward, Greenfields, Radnor, late an Officer in H.M.'s 69th Regt. Aug 7. Cheese, Rhayader

FRIDAY, July 11, 1879.

Atkinson, John, Bramhall, Chester, Farmer. Sept 1. Kent, Liverpool
 Bayley, Thomas, Loughborough, Leicester, Gent. Aug 7. Deane and Hands, Loughborough
 Baynes, Elizabeth, Clement's lane, Lombard st, Stationer. Aug 30. Cole, Church art, Clement's lane
 Briggs, Martha, Haxington, Derby. Oct 1. Taylor
 Cammack, Frances, Hulloft, Lincoln. Aug 18. Mason
 Clare, the Right Hon. Elizabeth Julia Georgiana, Countess Dowager of Ryde, Isle of Wight. Aug 15. Bray and Warrens, Great Russell st, London
 Coleman, Thomas, Mansfield, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Sept 30. Maltby, Mansfield
 Covell, Elizabeth, Lower Sydenham, Kent. Sept 15. Buchanan and Rogers, Basinghall st
 Crawshaw, John, Edge Hill, Liverpool. Aug 14. Elgood, Old sq Lincoln's inn
 Crouch, Walter, Cheshunt, Hertford, Gent. Sept 1. King and Peto, Abchurch lane
 Dowdney, Samuel, Brixham, Devon, Gent. Aug 12. Lowless and Co, Martin's lane, Cannon st
 Dudley, Thomas, Mapledurwell, Hants, Watercress Grower. Sept 1. Brundrett and Co, Temple
 Eays, William, Upper John st, Islington, Gent. Sept 22. Macarthur, John st, Bedford row
 Egley, Helena Elizabeth, Connaught sq. Aug 12. Gregory, Clement's lane, Strand
 Evans, Eliza, Holland rd, Brixton. Aug 14. Nicol and Co, Lime st
 Farin, Rosy Amabella, Bridge Cottage, Upper Edmonton. Aug 21. Wigg, Queen Victoria st
 Griffiths, Jane Jennett, Llandilo, Carmarthen. Aug 11. Bishop, Llandilo
 Grimston, the Hon. Katherine Georgiana, Red-liffe gardens, South Kensington. Aug 19. Nicholson and Herbert, New st, Spring gardens
 Grover, Isabella, Cliffe, nr Lewes. Aug 31. Hunt and Co, Lewes
 Hamer, Eliza, Chesham Hospital, Manchester. Aug 23. Taylor and Co, Manchester
 Hollingsworth, Cecilia, Brunswick sq, Camberwell. Aug 29. Spence and Co, Hertford
 Horner, William George, Knos'rop, Leeds, Market Gardener. Aug 2. Bointon, Leeds
 Hughes, Stephen Astbury, Spratslade, Stafford, Ironmonger. Aug 9
 Clarke and Hawley, Longton
 Kemp, Thomas, Walthamstow, Essex, Esq. Aug 31. Young, Newgate st
 King, Alfred, Walling st, Warehouseman. Sept 1. Heather and Sons, Paternoster row
 Liston, Maria Simpson, Bridge-avenue, Hammersmith. Aug 9. Jacobs and Vincent, Budge-row
 Lloyd, Mary, Longhouse, Pembroke. Aug 9. Davies and Co, Haverfordwest
 Neale, George, Mansfield, Nottingham, Currier. Sept 30. Maltby, Mansfield
 Peddie, Marjory Jane, Wandsworth Common, Surrey. Aug 26. Kimber, Lombard st
 Poore, Joseph, Newport, Isle of Wight, Stonemason. Aug 11. Pittis, Newport
 Rich, William, Shellingford, Berks, Farmer. Aug 30. Crowdy and son, Farnford
 Richardson, Mary, Berwick-upon-Tweed. July 31. Douglas, Berwick-upon-Tweed
 Sherwin, Joseph, Istock, Leicester, out of business. Sept 1. Goodger, Burton-on-Trent
 Sopp, James, Wandsworth, Surrey. Sept 9. Corsellis, East Hill, Wandsworth
 Walley, William Wilkinson, Leeds, Wool Merchant. Sept 1. Simpson and Butrell, Leeds
 Warrington, Betty, Urnston, Lancaster. Aug 23. Taylor and Co, Manchester
 Webber, James, Purbrook, Southampton, Grocer. Aug 11. Blaker and Reed, Portsea
 Wheatley, Elizabeth Holmes, Leicester. Aug 9. Bradshaw, Nottingham
 Williams, James Weston, Church rd, Islington, Clerk. Sept 1. Chamberlain, Basinghall st

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, July 11, 1879.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
 To Surrender in London.

Doyle, William Le Hunte, Boulogne-sur-Mer, France. Pet July Murray. July 22 at 11
 Holmes, Stephen, shrubland grove, Dalston, Market Clerk. Pet Ju 7. Murray. July 22 at 12
 Kiell, George Middleton, St Helen's pl, Bishopsgate st, Underwriter. Pet July 8. Hazlitt. July 23 at 2

To Surrender in the Country.

Crosland, John, jun, Batley, York, Wholesale Grocer. Pet July Nelson. Dewsbury, July 24 at 3
 Davis, David Joseph, Cheetham, Manchester, Jeweller. Pet July 7 Hulton. Salford, July 23 at 11
 Mawhood, John Parkinson, Sheffield, Merchant. Pet July 9. Rodgers Sheffield, July 21 at 11
 Parker, Clement, Birchfields, Stafford, Builder. Pet July 9. Parry. Birmingham, July 23 at 2
 Pugsley, William, Bristol, out of business. Pet July 9. Harley. Bristol, July 23 at 2
 Shapcott, Charles, New Swindon, Wilts, Grocer. Pet July 7. Townshead. Swindon, July 24 at 10.30
 Way, Thomas, St Thomas the Apostle, Devon, Retired Farmer. Pet July 8. Daw. Exeter, July 24 at 11
 Williams, John Blasenavon, Monmouth, Draper. Pet July 7. Shepard Tredgar, July 23 at 11

Tuesday, July 15, 1879.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1859.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.

Dickenson, George Francis, Gracechurch st, Merchant. Pet July 13.
Brougham. July 29 at 11.
Milver, Samuel, Kenilworth rd, Old Ford, out of business. Pet July 10.
Hazlitt. July 30 at 12.
Müller, Vianl, New Church rd, Camberwell, Manager. Pet July 10.
Hazlitt. July 30 at 12.30.
Philp, Edward, Gordon rd, Peckham, Clerk. Pet July 10. Hazlitt.
July 30 at 12.

To Surrender in the Country.

Boon, William Henry, Castle Cary, Somerset, Innkeeper. Pet July 11.
Bates. Tewill. July 25 at 11.
Lee, John, Steelford, Boot Manufacturer. Pet July 10. Spilsbury.
Stafford, July 29 at 2.
Way, John, St Thomas the Apostle, Devon, Retired Farmer. Pet July 8.
Daw. Exeter, July 26 at 11, instead of the 24th as previously ordered.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, July 11, 1879.

Best, Thomas Scrase, Bradford, Pork, Auctioneer. July 9.
Davies, David, Tylwyn, near Pontypool. June 24.
Rhodes, James, Roundhay, near Leeds, Woollenweaver. July 9.

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

Abell, John Hall, and George Abell, Hincley, Leicester, Hosiery Manufacturers. July 25 at 12 at offices of Haxey, Belvoir st Leicester.
Adams, Edward, Wallingford, Berks, Corn Dealer. July 26 at 12.30 at the George Inn, High st, Wallingford.
Alcock, Walter, Balsall Heath, Worcester, Grocer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham.
Archib, John, Liverpool, Manager to a Public Company. July 24 at 3 at offices of Jones and Price, North John st, Liverpool.
Ashworth, Richard Wood, Stockstades, Lancaster, Watchmaker. July 23 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester.
Baker, Thomas, Cardiff, Coal Merchant. July 23 at 11 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff.
Balmford, Alfred, Everton, near Liverpool, Draper. Aug 1 at 2 at offices of Forshaw and Hawkins Harrington st, Liverpool.
Barks, David, Leeds, Publisher's Agent. July 23 at 2 at offices of Horsfall and Latimer, Park row, Leeds.
Bate, Charles Head, Tisbury, Salop, Farmer. July 22 at 12.30 at offices of Batts, 35, Leonard's, Bridgworth.
Beckett, Charles, Strand, Refreshment Caterer. July 21 at 10 at offices of Micklethwait and Co, Long Acre.
Bell, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Greenkeeper. July 23 at 2 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Bickley, Henry, Trinity st, Southwark, out of business. July 30 at 3 at offices of Chipperfield, Trinity st, Southwark.
Blackoe, Edward, Barrow-in-Furness, Grocer. July 25 at 11 at the Imperial Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness.
Bolton, Ralph, Bling, Lancaster, Farmer. July 30 at 11 at offices of Masters and Son, Hopwood chambers, King st, Wigan.
Booth, James, Warwick, Saddler. July 24 at 11 at offices of Sanderson, Church st, Warwick.
Brash, William Archibald, Goole, York, Licensed Victualler. July 24 at 2 at offices of Pearson and Burtonshaw, Crowle.
Bright, William, Machesver, Wms Retailer. July 23 at 3 at 35, Cannon st, Manchester.
Brunt, Charles, Swallow Nest, near Rotherham, Beer-seller. July 24 at 2 at offices of Badgers and Co, Moorgate, at Rotherham.
Buller, Thomas, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Isels, Middle pavement, Nottingham.
Cashmore, Joseph Charles, Birmingham, Stationer. July 25 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Woakes, Temple st, Birmingham.
Chadwick, Thomas, Darlington, Durham, Builder. July 23 at 11 at offices of Robinson, Chancery lane, Darlington.
Chester-ton, John, Wrexham, Dealer in Fancy Goods. July 25 at 1 at the Feathers Inn, Great Charlotte st, Liverpool.
Clegg, William Henry, Stratford, Essex, Builder. July 24 at 3 at the Court house, Stratford.
Colmer, Robert Slater, Bournemouth, Doctor of Medicine (U.S.A.). July 21 at 12.30 at the London Hotel, Poole.
Conner, Frederick, Bradford, York, out of business. July 22 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Markes st, Bradford.
Crane, George, Dunganona Terrace, Walsam Green, Chiossmonger. July 23 at 2 at offices of Kisch and Co, Chancery lane.
Craven, Thomas, Shipley, York, Stuff Finisher. July 24 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford.
Crawshaw, Thomas, Southgate, Halifax, trading as the Excelsior Tea Company. July 25 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax.
Daunt, Edward Sygne Townend, Sharncliffe villa, Chelms, Brewer. July 30 at 3 at offices of Bradford, Winchester House, Old Broad st.
David, Albion, Highbury, Livery Stable Keeper. July 21 at 4 at 62 Chancery lane, Marsh.
Davidge, Frederick, Yarrington, Somerset, Carpenter. July 22 at 11 at the Wellington Hotel, Bruton, Bath, Bruton.
Dedcock, John Richard, Coventry, Musician. July 21 at 2 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson pl, New st, Birmingham.
Fitter, Birmingham.
Deeley, John Richard, Narrow st, Limehouse, Iron Merchant. July 24 at 2 at offices of Morphet and Hanson, King st, Chesapeake, Terry, King st.
Diler, Albert, Bury, Lancaster, Watchmaker. July 23 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Manchester.
Drabbs, George, Kirk Stunston, York, Farmer. July 23 at 3 at the Elephant Hotel, Pontefract, Foster and Haper, Hopergate, Pontefract.
Duce, Joseph, Bradford, York, Sanitary Tube Dealer. July 23 at 13 at offices of Peel and Gaunt, Chapel lane, Bradford.
Dogdale, John, Leek, Lancashire, Farmer. July 25 at 1 at Royal Hotel, Kirby Lonsdale.
Elliott, Joseph, Stafford, Grocer. July 25 at 11 at offices of Bowen, Martin st, Stafford.

Edwards, Henry, Newton Heath, Manchester, Cab Proprietor. July 30 at 3 at Commercial Hotel, Brown st, Manchester.
Easton, George, Claverdon, Warwick, Builder. July 18 at 1 at offices of Sanderson, Church st, Warwick.
Fosdick, Richard George, Cambridge st, Pancras rd, Coal Merchant. July 30 at 2 at Great Northern Hotel, Wellington st, Leeds.
Fowler, John Kersley, and John Kersley Henry Fowler, Aylesbury, Wine Merchants. July 25 at 2 at offices of Foreman and Co, Gresham st, Goldring, Southampton st, Bloomsbury.
Fowler, Thomas, Banbury, Oxford, Auctioneer. July 22 at 3 at Red Lion Hotel, Banbury.
Gibbard, Thomas, Mollington, Oxford, Farmer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Pain and Rawlin, Bridge st, Banbury.
Gomersall, Alfred, Salford, near Halifax, Printer. July 35 at 11 at offices of Leeming, Westgate, Halifax.
Gooden, Ann, Plymouth grove, Manchester. July 29 at 4 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, Norfolk st, Manchester.
Goron, Matthew Hilton, Little Hulton, Lancaster, Painter. July 22 at 3 at offices of Ryley and Haslam, Mawdsley st, Bolton.
Goss, William Adams, Eilscombe, Torquay, Builder. July 24 at 3 at Victoria and Albert, Torquay.
Grant, George Palfreyman, Salford, Lancashire, File Manufacturer. July 29 at 3 at offices of Sanderson, Church st, Manchester.
Hale, James, Biggleswade, Bedford, General Dealer. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Mitchell and Webb, St Paul's sq, Bedford.
Hall, John, and Samuel Hall, Bearnley, Lancashire, Brickmakers. July 24 at 2.30 at offices of Molesworth, The Walk, Roehdale.
Hardisty, John Frederic, Bradford, York, Grocer. July 23 at 10 at offices of Peel and Gaunt, Chapel lane, Bradford.
Harverson, Joseph, jun, High st, Hoxton, Corn Dealer. July 24 at 2 at offices of Bridger, Botolph's lns, Epsom.
Hawthorn, Henry, Knightsbridge, Coachbuilder. July 19 at 10 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Mayhew, Waterloo.
Hodge, Thomas Henry, Newport, Monmouth, Confectioner. July 21 at 13 at offices of Williams and Young, Commercial st, Newport.
Herbert, Thomas, Reading, no occupation. July 21 at 11 at Wansheaf Hotel, Friar st, Reading.
Hill, George, Duke st, Bloomsbury, House Decorator. July 17 at 12 at offices of Marchant, Ludgate hill.
Hobbs, Mary Ann, Plumstead, Kent, out of business. July 25 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane.
Hodgsworthy, Daniel Bolland, Bradford, York, Bookseller. July 24 at 2 at offices of Arkison, Tyndal st, Bradford.
Hollington, James, Prince's Risborough, Buckingham, Draper. July 25 at 2 at offices of Nicholls, Gresham st, Nicholson, Bedford.
Holmes, William, Lyndhurst, Southampton, Draper. July 25 at 2 at offices of Pearce and Co, Lansdowne House, Castle st, Southampton.
Hopper, Thomas, Coventry, Printer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Killy, Priory row, Coventry.
Hoyland, William, Be-wick, Manchester, Builder. July 29 at 11 at offices of Rowley and Co, Clarence buildings, Booth st, Manchester.
Icke, William Henry, Ch-t-r, Dealer in Works of Art. July 21 at 11 at offices of Churton, Eastgate buildings, Chester.
Jase, William, Loftus-in-Cleveland, York, Grocer. July 30 at 11 at offices of Jackson, Albert rd, Middlesborough.
Jennings, James, Middlesborough, York, Coal Merchant. July 23 at 3 at offices of Belk and Parrington, Post office chambers, Marion road, Middlesborough.
Jones, Edward, Barsley, York, Grocer. July 31 at 4.30 at offices of Rideal, Chronicle chambers, Barnley.
Jones, Robert, Barrow-in-Furness, Blockmaker. July 24 at 11 at Imperial Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness.
Kendall, Robert, Barrow-in-Furness, Nalder and Jones, Barrow-in-Furness.
Kent, William, Derby, Baker. July 25 at 12 at offices of Heath, Amal alley, Derby.
Kilby, Joseph, Liverpool, Builder. July 23 at 2 at offices of Parkians, Commerce st, Lord st, Liverpool.
Knight, Edwin, and John Neville Knight, Burbage, Leicester, Hosiery Manufacturers. July 23 at 11 at George Hotel, Hincley, Birmingham.
Laidlaw, James, Liverpool, Draper. July 31 at 3 at offices of Nordan and Levy, Victoria st, Liverpool.
Lecher, Thomas William, H-y-s, Kent, Carpenter. July 29 at 11 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st, Gregory, M-crate st.
Levi, Hannah, Sherlock st, Birmingham. July 25 at 11 at offices of Taylor, Colmore row, Birmingham.
Lord, John Ashworth, Barrow-in-Furness, Sewing Machine Dealer. July 24 at 11 at the Imperial Hotel, Cornwallis st, Barrow-in-Furness.
Loveday, Charles Perkins, Northampton, Builder. July 21 at 12 at the Dolphin Hotel, Gold st, Northampton.
Lyons, Daniel, Kingston-upon-Hull, Butcher. July 26 at 12 at offices of Irons and Son, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull.
MacVaugh, Frederick, Cameron (and not MacVaugh, as erroneously printed in last Gazette), Darlington, Tailors' Assistant. July 21 at 11 at offices of Wooler, Priestgate, Darlington.
Magmos, Henry Henry, Leeds, Bootmaker. July 25 at 12 at offices of Moleton, Park row, Leeds.
Malings, Robert, Add-rbury East, Oxford, Farmer. July 31 at 11 at offices of Faulkner and Coggins, Deddington.
Marsh, James, Ashford, Kent, Fruiterer. July 23 at 11 at offices of Hallett and Co, Ashford.
Martin, William, Campbell, Birmingham, Coal Merchant. July 23 at 12 at offices of Jagger, Cherry st, Birmingham.
McElroy, Francis, Manchester, Optician. July 22 at 3 at offices of Pritchard and Co, Little Trinity lane, London.
Merzer, Marcus Robert, Lymington, out of business. July 24 at 12 at offices of Davis, Portland st, Southampton.
Merriman, William George, Spring Vale, nr Wolverhampton, Iron-masor. July 14 at 12 at offices of Matthews and Smith, Waterloo st, Birmingham.
Shakespeare, Oldbury.

July
Metcalf,
and G
Mossy,
Norton
Murry,
son and
Naylor,
at office
Ogle, and
at 3 at
Palmer, S
Pembroke
Palm, Du
offices of
Pearson,
offices of
Phillips,
offices of
Piane, H
of East
Pope, Tom
Mugent
Perriman,
Alexander
Tyne
Raves, Wi
of Palace
Rear, Edw
ton Hotel
Robbins, J
shaw and
Ridg, Geo
Batters
Restall, W
of the Ric
Elice, Rich
of Quille
Relandson
the Finche
Roberts, A
George H
Roberts, B
offices of
Roberts, L
at offices
Roberts, R
British H
Robinson, G
at offices
Rogers, J
at offices
Scott, John
King's H
market
Shubbs, th
at 12 at
a Sociat, P
at 3 at off
chatter
Smith, Thom
of Jackm
Stobridge,
turer, J
Summerfield
Peel Arms
Swaine, Will
Darey, at
Swift, George
Tallford, Wil
offices of
Tatnell, J
offices of
Thacker, Geo
the Craven
Tinsford, Al
36 at 11 at
Tonia, Josiah
11 at offices
Unward, Will
1 at the Lu
pers
Wardrop, of
offices of St
Whitcomb,
Manufactu
Whitcomb,
Whitcomb, J
offices of
Wilkinson, Jo
Buck-lit-V
Wilson, Alfre
Hamer and
Wilson, Edwa
at 1 at offic
Wright, Will
offices of C
ham at
Young, Char
Junction H
Young, Robe
Timber Merc
Sunderland
Alams, Thom
Sweeting, J

Metcalf, Thomas, Bradford, Engineer. July 23 at 3 at offices of Peel and Grant, Chapel lane, Bradford.

Mossy, John, Liverpool, Provision Dealer. July 29 at 3 at offices of Nelson and Levy, Victoria st, Liverpool.

Murphy, James, Leeds, Lamp Dealer. July 24 at 3 at offices of Eddison and Addison, Albion st, Leeds.

Naylor, William, Kingston-upon-Hull, Ruff Merchant. July 24 at 11 at offices of Priestman, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull.

Ogle, Andrew, and Alfred Pickard, Burnley, Cotton Spinners. July 30 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester.

Palmer, Samuel, Colinton, Devon, Farmer. July 26 at 12 at offices of Post Office st, Bedford circus, Exeter. Forward.

Palton, David, Cole Pitchard, Hereford, Farmer. July 24 at 11 at offices of Garrod, Widemarch st, Herford.

Pearson, Thomas, Kingston-upon-Hull, Bootmaker. July 21 at 2 at offices of Watson and Son, Parlaments st, Hull.

Phillips, William, Hlswain, Aberdeen, Inkeeper. July 23 at 1 at offices of Howell, Canon st, Aberdeen.

Plano, Henry William, Birmingham, Carver. July 19 at 10.30 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham.

Pope, Tom, Birmingham, Artist. July 26 at 11 at offices of Clark, Regent st, Cheltenham.

Purvis, William, Sunderland, Auctioneer. July 21 at 3 at the Alexandra Hotel, John st, Sunderland. Clark, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Rave, William, Gosforth, Cumberland, Carrier. July 25 at 12 at offices of Patson, Irish st, Whitehaven.

Reay, Edward, Manchester, Boot Dealer. July 24 at 3 at the Wellington Hotel, Granby st, Leicester. Edwards, Manchester.

Reddih, John, Manchester, Druggist. July 25 at 4 at offices of Addis and Warburton, Norfolk st, Manchester.

Reid, George Percival, Warwick, Draper. July 24 at 12 at offices of Sanderson, Church st, Warwick.

Retall, William Charles, Prestige, Radnor, Plumber. July 22 at 1.30 at the Royal Oak Hotel, Leominster. Corner, Hereford.

Rice, Richard Henry, Liverpool, Confectioner. July 30 at 3 at offices of Quilliam, Old Post Office place, Liverpool.

Robinson, John, Hythe, Kent, Licensed Victualler. July 28 at 3 at the Pier-de-Lis Hotel, Canterbury. Mowll, Dover.

Roberts, Albert, Cockington, York, Currier. July 25 at 3 at the George Hotel, Cockington. Carr and Co, Cockington.

Roberts, Emma, Gorton, Lancaster, Provision Dealer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Harris, Fetter lane, Manchester.

Roberts, Lewis, Manchester, Toilet Quilt Manufacturer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Boote and Edgar, Booth st, Manchester.

Roberts, Robert, Carnarvon, Provision Dealer. July 25 at 2.30 at the British Hotel, Bangor. Jones and Roberts, Carnarvon.

Robinson, George, Eastington lane, Durham, Cartwright. Aug 5 at 11 at offices of Moore and Co, Fawcett st, Sunderland.

Rogers, James, Swinton, Lancashire, Hammer Maker. July 24 at 3 at offices of Rutter and Lowe, Mosley st, Manchester.

Scott, John Stearn, Ipswich, out of business. July 24 at 12 at the King's Head Hotel, Stowmarket. Marriott and Hayward, Stowmarket.

Shuttleham, John Joseph, Birmingham, Iron Bedstead Maker. July 25 at 12 at offices of Marigold and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham.

Sociely, Peter Arm-trong, Whittington, Lancashire, Grocer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Hankinson, Queen's chambers, John Dalton st, Manchester.

Smith, Thomas, Falkingham, Suffolk, Builder. July 30 at 12 at offices of Jackman and Sons, Silent st, Ipswich.

Stockbridge, Jessie, Pontonville rd, King's Cross, Bedding Manufacturer. July 22 at 3 at offices of Holmes, Eastcheap.

Sunderland, John Edward, Tamworth, Grocer. July 21 at 12 at the Fern Hotel, Tamworth. Beaton and Robinson, Tamworth.

Swain, Willie, Bradford, Grocer. July 24 at 4 at offices of Wright, Darcy st, Bradford.

Swill, George, Wrockwathine, S.lop, Shingler. July 24 at 3 at the Quarry Inn, St. George's. Phillips and Co, Shifnal.

Tallop, William, Blue Town, Sheerness, Tailor. July 23 at 11 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne.

Tattersall, John, Omega place, Regent's park, Builder. July 23 at 3 at offices of Eyre and Co, John st, Bedford row.

Thacker, George Frederick, Coventry, Cabinet Maker. July 21 at 3 at the Craven Arms Hotel, Coventry. Kilby, Coventry.

Trimpson, Alfred Newton, Wolverhampton, Commercial Traveller. July 25 at 11 at offices of Langman, Queen st, Wolverhampton.

Toms, Joseph Albert, Birmingham, Pearl Button Maker. July 21 at 11 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham.

Upward, William Henry, Newbury, 1st of Wight, Printer. July 23 at 1 at the Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn, London. Joyce, Newport.

Wardropper, Anthony, Sunderland, House Builder. July 23 at 11 at offices of Stokes, Fawcett st, Sunderland.

Whitesmith, John Thomas, Kidderminster, Worcester, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. July 23 at 3.30 at offices of Miller and Co, Church st, Kidderminster.

Whiteley, Noah, Ilkeston, Derby, Licensed Victualler. July 30 at 3 at offices of Bright, Town Club chambers, Wheeler gate, Nottingham.

Williams, John, Ormskirk, Lancaster, Grocer. July 26 at 11 at the Beck-ib-Vine Inn, Birkenhead, Ormskirk. Lees, Wigan.

Wilson, Alfred, Seely, Lancaster, Grocer. July 24 at 3 at offices of Harner and Son, Clarendon st, Manchester.

Winn, Edward, Ackenwalth, Westmoreland, Shoemaker. July 22 at 1 at offices of Dobson, Finkle st, Kendal.

Wright, William, Cable st, Whitechapel, Draper. July 24 at 11 at offices of Clemens, Queen st, Cheapside. Haigh and Agar, Gresham st.

Young, Charles, Puddletown, Dorset, Builder. July 22 at 2 at the Junction Hotel, Dorchester. Burcott, Dorchester.

Young, Robert, Jun, and Benjamin Harrison Robson, Sunderland, Timber Merchants. July 24 at 11 at offices of Stokes, Fawcett st, Sunderland.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1879.

Allbutt, Henry, The Cedars, Hampton Wick, no occupation. Aug 6 at 2 at offices of Lawrence and Co, Old Jewry chambers.

Anderson, Robert, Crowle, Worcester, Farmer. Aug 1 at 12 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, The Cross, Worcester.

Andrews, John Clarke, Barton Bradstock, Dorset, Flax Manufacturer. July 31 at 3 at offices of Gundry, Downe st, Bridport. Lock and Son, Dorchester.

Babb, Thomas, Dartmouth, Auctioneer. July 30 at 1 at offices of Southcott, Post Office st, Exeter. Pearce, Plymouth.

Banham, John, Sheffield, Steel Manufacturer. July 23 at 12 at offices of Porrett, Bank st, Sheffield.

Barber, Thomas, Brady st, Bethnal green, Timber Merchant. July 29 at 3 at offices of Wildecombe, Metropolitan chambers, Broad st.

Barlow, Mark, Unsworth, Lancashire, Stone mason. July 30 at 3 at offices of Arderton, Garden st, Bury.

Baxendale, Richard, and Joseph Heid, Chorley, Lancashire, Wagon Builders. Aug 6 at 2 at the London and North Western Hotel, Crewe Railway Station, Crewe. Jackson, Chorley.

Bayley, Charles, Stockport, Earthenware Dealer. July 26 at 11 at offices of Garthwaite, Braddon st, Manchester.

Beckett, Richard, Church row, Wandsworth, Saddler. Aug 1 at 2 at offices of Terry and Bians, Chancery lane.

Bennett, John, Bristol, Coal Merchant. July 22 at 2 at offices of Tribe and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Salmon, Bristol.

Benson, George, Batley, York, Brickmaker. July 30 at 11.30 at offices of Shaw, Bond st, Dewsbury.

Bleasdale, William, Lancashire, Grocer. July 25 at 2 at the King's Arms Hotel, Lancaster. Welch, Lancaster.

Bond, Henry, Masborough, York, Grocer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Willis, Church st, Eberham.

Brazari, Giulio, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Furniture Dealer. July 25 at 12 at offices of Rhazg, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Bransby, Russell, Birmingham, Patent Omnibus Register Proprietor. July 28 at 3 at offices of Follows, Cherry st, Birmingham.

Bridge, Richard, and Joseph Broadhurst, Hulme, Bricklayers. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Credland, Cross st, Manchester.

Briggs, Thomas, Accrington, Soda Water Manufacturer. July 31 at 3 at 14, St James's st, Accrington. Barlow, Accrington.

Brown, Walter, Barnsey, Confectioner. July 30 at 4 at offices of Gray, E state, Burnsey.

Burr, Harry, Coleman st, Commission Agent. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of Kaye and Co, King st, Cheshire.

Burton, Frederick, Leicester, Jeweller. July 30 at 11 at offices of Peel, Colmore row, Birmingham.

Catlow, Hugh, Church, Lancashire, Oil Merchant. July 30 at 3 at offices of Ballard, St James st, Accrington.

Chadwick, Charles Henry, Manchester, Lund Agent. Aug 5 at 3 at the Thatched House Hotel, New Market pl, Manchester. Brett and Craven, Manchester.

Cheetham, Samuel, Rough Close, Stans, Stafford, Farmer. July 28 at 11 at the Lion and Swan Hotel, West st, Congleton. Garside, Congleton.

Churchill, Samuel, Bath, Tailor. July 24 at 12 at the Macons' Hall Tavern, Basil-chall st, Lvnlon. Bartram and Bartlett, Bath.

Clark, John, Wolverhampton, Builder. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Green, Corporation st, Wolverhampton.

Clayton, William, Jarrow, Durham, Greengrocer. July 31 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Cliff, John, Kettering, Northampton, Coal Merchant. July 28 at 2 at the George Hotel, Kettering. Freedy, Kettering.

Clutton, George, Clutton, Salop, Beerhouse Keeper. Aug 6 at 12 at the Swan Hotel, Bridgnorth. Hasewood, Bridgnorth.

Cochell, Elias, Rochdale, Brickmaker. July 29 at 3 at offices of Whitehead, Tread lane, Rochdale.

Coe, George, Starling, Downham Market, Norfolk, Tea Dealer. Aug 2 at 12 at the County Court House, Downham Market. Reed and Wayman, Downham Market.

CConnell, Edward, Porobello rd, Notting hill, Boot Maker. July 29 at 1 at offices of Brown, Lincoln's inn fields.

Cooke, Benjamin, Crewe Town, Cheshire, Draper. July 29 at 12 at the Lamb Hotel, Nantwich. Brooke, Nantwich.

Cooke, George Leeds, Boot Manufacturer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Cranswick, Park row, Leeds.

Cooper, Charles Joseph, Leytonstone, Tinsmith in High Court. July 21 at 3 at offices of Marshall and Clark, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn.

Cooper, Maria, Birmingham, Milliner. July 28 at 3 at offices of Grove, Atlas chambers, Paradise st, Birmingham.

Cowles, John William, Gloucester, Brewer. July 26 at 1 at offices of Beckinham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol.

Cox, William Henry, Birmingham, Smallware Dealer. July 25 at 12 at offices of Foster, Bennett's hill, Birmingham.

Damon, George Thomas, Llandport, Hants, Builder. July 28 at 3 at the Sussex Hotel, Russ ll st, Landport. Feltman, Port-sea.

Davenport, George, Nantwich, Cheshire, Boot Manufacturer. July 30 at 12 at the Wilbraham Arms Hotel, Welch row, Nantwich. Martin, Nantwich.

Davies, William, Garvach, Monmouth, Inkeeper. July 30 at 11 at offices of Shepard, Queen st, Tredegar.

Davis, John Affr, d, Cromwell terrace Harrow rd, Tailor. July 29 at 3 at offices of Baylis and Baylis, Lincoln's inn fields.

Duckworth, Joseph, Market Drayton, Salop, Paper Hanger. Aug 7 at 11 at the Adelphi Hotel, Earle st, Crewe. Hill, Crewe.

Eade, Charles Henry, R-man rd, North Row, Book-binder. July 30 at 2 at offices of Waring, Borough High st, Southwark.

Evans, George, Bathoaston, Somerset, Farmer. July 29 at 12 at offices of Wilton and Sons, Westgate bldgs, Bath.

Fagg, George, King's rd, Chelsea, Greengrocer. July 24 at 11 at offices of Boyden, Bennett's hill, Doctor's Commons.

Fauchon, Mary Kains, and Harriett Fauchon, Maidstone, Fancy Shop Keepers. Aug 8 at 12 at offices of Stephens, Week st, Maidstone.

Ferguson, Charles Augustus, St Petersburg pl, Baywater, Ostler. July 30 at 3 at offices of Carr and Co, Vigo st, Regent st.

Foster, John, Jun, Nottingham, Butcher. July 28 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham.

Fowler, John Kereley, Aylebury, Buckingham, Wine Merchant. July 23 at 3 at offices of Foreman and Co, Gresham st, Goldring, Southampton st, Boomsbury.

- Foulger, John Charles, Golborne rd, Notting hill, Insurance Agent. July 31 at 19 at offices of Pettengill, Walbrook
- Fowler, John Kersley Henry, Aynsbury, Buckingham, Wine Merchant. July 25 at 4 at offices of Foreman and Co, Gresham st. Goldring, Southampton st, Bloomsbury
- Frankland, Allred, Manningham, York, Grocer. July 23 at 10 at offices of Singleton, New Booth st, Bradford
- Fryer, John Asley, Trowbridge, Wilts, Farmer. July 29 at 12 at the Mart, Manvers st, Trowbridge. Jones, Trowbridge
- Fuelling, Edward, and David Fuelling, Tottenham Court rd, Corn Dealers. July 23 at 3 at offices of Marshall and Clark, Portugal st, Lincoln's Inn
- Gepu, Arthur Midmay, Rood lane, China Merchant. July 30 at 2 at offices of Barrow and Gates, Gresham st. Murray and Co, Birch Lane
- Gough, Edward William, Walsall, Saddler. July 28 at 3 at offices of Duignan and Co, The Bridge, Walsall
- Graham, William Richard, Stockton, Auctioneer. July 24 at 3 at offices of Dods and Co, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
- Griffiths, Francis, Spennymore, Durham, Ironmonger. July 31 at 11 at offices of Thompson and Lisle, Sadler st, Durham
- Griffiths, Jeremiah, Blackwood, Mon, Cattle Sausman. July 28 at 11 at offices of Shepard, Queen st, Tredgar
- Gutteridge, William Henry, Bedworth, Warwick, Baker. July 24 at 11 at offices of Hughes and Maser, Little Park st, Coventry
- Hall, William, Overingham, Northumberland, Licensed Victualler. July 20 at 12 at offices of Bury, Hexham
- Hallas, Joseph, Kingston-upon-Hull, General Dealer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Sykes and Son, Market st, Huddersfield
- Hammond, Edwin, Leasingham, Lincoln, Farmer. July 26 at 11 at offices of Peake and Co, Seaford
- Harding, James, Lowestoft, Ironmonger. July 31 at 2 at the Suffolk Hotel, Lowestoft. Emerson, Norwich
- Harding, William, Birmingham, House Painter. July 23 at 11 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
- Hargreaves, Joseph Ellis, Batley Carr, York, Printer. July 26 at 3 at offices of Wooler, Exchange buildings, Batley
- Harrison, Elisha, Australian avenue, Jewin crescent, Licensed Victualler. July 28 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Maçons' avenue, Basinghall st. Layton and Co, Budge row
- Harrison, William, Mardach, Falmouth, Photographic Artist. Aug 3 at 11.30 at offices of Rogers, Arwenack st, Falmouth
- Hayman, George, Exeter, Gent. July 23 at 11 at offices of Gidley, Bedford circus, Exeter
- Haynes, Thomas, Orpington, Kent, Farmer. July 28 at 3 at offices of Waddell and Co, Queen Victoria st. Ashurst and Co, Old Jewry
- Hayward, Mary Maunda, Chirton, Wilts, Farmer. July 29 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, Devizes. Meek and Jackson, Devizes
- Heape, William, Brewood, Stafford, Grocer. July 31 at 11 at offices of Flewker and Pace, Darlington st, Wolverhampton
- Hilder, William, Sevenoaks, Kent, Coal Merchant. July 26 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee H. use, Gresham st. Knockr, Sevenoaks
- Hill, Henry Mark, Wolverhampton, Brickmaker. July 23 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
- Hindle, George Edwin, West Gorton, Manchester, Chemist. July 29 at 3 at offices of Williams, Barton arcade. Grundy and Co, Bury
- Hobbs, James Walter, Lowestoft, Tobaccoist. July 31 at 12 at offices of Seago, High st, Lowestoft
- Hopkins, Charles John White, High st, Clapham, Hatter. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Buchanan and Rogers, Basinghall st
- Humphreys, Richard, Birmingham, Furniture Dealer. July 28 at 12 at offices of Cottrell and Son, Temple row, Birmingham
- Hutton, John, Sheffield, Engineer. July 25 at 11 at the Incorporated Law Society, Aldine court, High st, Sheffield. Vickers and son, Sheffield
- Jackson, William, Leicester, Stationer. July 25 at 12 at offices of Fowler and Co, Grey Friars' chamber, Friar lane, Leicester
- Jeffreys, William, bailes, Brecon, Farmer. July 31 at 11 at offices of Thomas, High st, Brecon
- Jones, William, Newport, Monmouth, Grocer. Aug 6 at 12 at offices of Lawrence, Bank chambers, Newport
- Keynes, William, Lytchett Minister, Dorset, Baker. July 25 at 3 at offices of Travanion, New st, Poole
- Kinsman, John Clough, Saltash, Cornwall, Saddler. July 28 at 2 at offices of Cleverton and Son, Princess's place chambers, Plymouth
- Kitson, John, Cannock, Stafford, Grocer. July 26 at 11 at offices of Loxton, The Bridge, Walsall
- Layton, Charles, and George Stephen Fleming, New Windsor, Berks, Coal Merchants. July 29 at 11 at Licks' Coffee house, Fleet st, London. Jones
- Leatham, John, and Thomas Ridings, Blackley, Lancashire, Bleachers. July 30 at 3 at offices of Hankinson, Queen's chambers, John Dalton st, Manchester
- Lee, William, Kingskerswell, Devon. July 23 at 11 at offices of And & Co, Bedford circus, Exeter. Francis and Baker, Newton Abbott
- Lesse, Edward Titus, Longton, Fish Merchant. July 25 at 11 at the Swan Hotel, Longton
- Lepper, Robert, Caversham, Oxford, Farmer. July 29 at 11 at offices of Mills, Market Hill, Bicester
- Lloyd, Ernest, Blomfield st, Solicitor. July 23 at 10 at 8, Blomfield st, Ludgate, Robert Howman, Devonport, Lissos Grove. July 30 at 3 at offices of Beard and Son, Basinghall st
- Mackay, Joseph, Bristol, Confectioner. July 25 at 2 at offices of Dix Siby, Exchange West
- Maise, William, Darvall, Sheffield, Joiner. July 28 at 11 at offices of Allen, George st, Sheffield
- Mansell, Charles John, St John's Hill, New Wandsworth, Music Seller. July 30 at 2 at offices of Epper and Son, Winchester house, Old Broad st
- Marshall, George Samuel, Birmingham, Beerhouse keeper. July 25 at 3.0 at offices of Bunkle and Claes, Waterloo st, Birmingham. Miller and Co, Kidderminster
- McLaren, John, Rotherhithe, Surrey, Assistant at an Infirmary. July 28 at 3 at offices of Marshall and Clark, Portugal st, Lincoln's Inn
- Mason, Robert, Middlesborough, Stationer. July 29 at 12 at offices of Jackson and Jackson, Albert rd, Middle borough
- Mercer, David, Manningham, York, Grocer. July 25 at 11 at offices of Moore, Albion chambers, Huestigate, Bradford
- Merchant, William, Wadhurst, Sussex, Saddler. July 25 at 11 at offices of Burton, Dyott terrace, Tunbridge Wells
- Mitchinson, William, Holme Cultram, Brick Maker. July 23 at 11 at offices of Donald and Ostell, Castle st, Carlisle
- Moore, Lemuel Watson, Great Grimby, Picture Dealer. July 23 at 2.45 at offices of Mason, Victoria at South, Great Grimby
- Mottram, Henry, Tamworth, B. slider. July 23 at 3 at offices of Newell and Atkins, Colehill, Tamworth
- Mulrow, Thomas, Birmingham, Lath Manufacturer. July 23 at 3 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
- Neville, Frederick Uriah, Otley, York, Courier. July 17 at 3 at offices of Lees and Co, New Ingate, Bradford
- Palmer, John, Boscary, Hereford, Innkeeper. July 25 at 12 at the Beauchamp Hotel, Great Malvern. Lambert, Malvern
- Parker, Joseph, Whitehaven, Painter. July 30 at 12 at offices of Parnell, Irish st, Whitehaven
- Phillips, George Anderson, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Watch Maker. July 25 at 3.30 at offices of Price, Dew st, Haverfordwest
- Porritt, Charlotte, and Henry Fisher, Horsham, nr Leeds, Carpet Yarn Manufacturers. July 31 at 2 at offices of North and Sons, Lancaster parade, Leeds
- Posou, Joseph Maurice, Portland Hotel, Great Portland st, no occupation. Nov 6 at 2 at offices of Sydney and Son, Finsbury crescent
- Popper, Samuel Ashton, Ancoats, Manchester, Grocer. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Woodall and Marriott, Norfolk st, Manchester
- Powell, William Walton, Solihull, Warwick, Builder. July 24 at 11 at offices of Dale and Vachell, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
- Redman, Mark, Folkestone, Boat Builder. July 23 at 3 at the King's Arms Hotel, Folkestone. Wightwick and Gardner, Folkestone
- Roberts, Richard, Birmingham, Watchmaker. July 25 at 3 at offices of Fallowe, Cherry st, Birmingham
- Rodman, William, Exeter, Brushmaker. July 26 at 1 at the Grand Hotel, Bristol. Hensell, Exeter
- Rower, James, Cardiff, Painter. July 26 at 10.30 at the Royal Hotel, St Mary st, Cardiff. Cousins, Cardiff
- Scantlebury, William, City rd, Model Maker. July 29 at 10 at offices of Evans, John st, Bedford row
- Seedell, John, Rochdale, Lancashire, Wine Merchant. July 30 at 3 at offices of Roper, Drake st, Rochdale
- Sharrock, Samuel, Bolton, Lancashire, Confectioner. July 29 at 3 at offices of Eley and Haslam, Mawdsley st, Bolton
- Shaw, Charles, Seinton, Nottingham, Glass Dealer. July 30 at 3 at offices of Whittingham, Middle pavement, Nottingham
- Shibthorp, William, Rochdale, Lancashire, Manager to a Wine Merchant. July 31 at 11 at offices of March, Lord st, Rochdale
- Simpson, Fisher, Oxford, no occupation. July 30 at 11 at offices of Mallam, High st, Oxford
- Smalpage, John Henry, Maddox st, Regent st, Tailor. July 29 at 11 at offices of Kemp and Co, Walbrook. Brandon, Essex st, Strand
- Southall, Samuel, Derby, Als Merchant. July 26 at 11 at the Bell Hotel, Sadler gate, Derby. Hexall, Drury
- Sparkes, John, Watham Abbey, Essex, Licensed Victualler. July 6 at 12.30 at the County Court, Waltham Abbey. Duffie and Bray, Tokenhouse yard
- Stannay, James, Miles Platting, Lancashire, Beerhouse keeper. July 31 at 3 at offices of Bowden, King st, Manchester
- Stevenson, Robert Edward, Oxford terrace, Fulham, out of business. Aug 5 at 3 at offices of Fernhill, Lower Thames st
- Stock, Thomas, Wilson st, Finsbury, General Agent. July 30 at 3 at offices of Morris, Carter lane, Doctor's commons
- Stockdale, William, Darlington, Durham, Commercial Traveller. July 29 at 10 at offices of Barton, High row, Darlington
- Sweeney, John, Manchester, Provision Merchant. July 30 at 3 at offices of Horner and Son, Clarence st, Manchester
- Taylor, Harry, Kidderminster, Grocer. July 23 at 11 at offices of Beale and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham
- Tellaw, Daniel, John Tellaw, and John Setcliffe, Elland, Halifax, Fishers. July 28 at 3 at the White Lion Hotel, Silver st, Halifax. Boocock, Halifax
- Thompson, John, Burrow-with-Burrow, Lancashire, Farmer. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Picard, Kirkby Lonsdale
- Thurston, George, Stratford New Town, Essex, Butcher. July 23 at 11 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Maçons' av. use, Basinghall st
- Gregory, Moorgate at
- Titcomb, Edward, Sevenoaks, Builder. July 26 at 12.30 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Knockr, Sevenoaks
- Torrance, John, Blackburn, Fancy Goods Dealer. July 25 at 11 at offices of Radcliffe, Clayton st, Blackburn
- Tranter, John, Birmingham, Baker. July 28 at 12 at offices of Morgan, Waterloo st, Birmingham
- Turton, James Mark, Cantlowes rd, Camden sq, General Merchant. July 25 at 2 at offices of Linklater and Co, Walbrook
- Vickers, Thomas, and William Vickers, Wotton, Cheshire, Farmers. July 26 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Crown, Fletcher, Northwich
- Waddington, John, Blackburn, New agent. July 28 at 3 at the Star and Garter Inn, Railway rd, Blackburn. Forshaw and Parker, Preston
- Warren, Francis Andrew, Shalomb's, Chelsea, no occupation. July 30 at 11 at offices of Curris and Betts, South sq, Gray's Inn
- Webster, George Edward, Nottingham, Civil Engineer. July 31 at 11 at the George Hotel, Nottingham. Buckley, Leicester
- Whitcroft, William, Berkeley st, Clerkenwell, Brass Founder. July 24 at 3 at offices of Stophar and Kundle, Coleman st
- Whitehouse, Thomas, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. July 29 at 12 at offices of Pointon, Temple row west, Birmingham
- Wilmors, George, Clifton st, Wandsworth rd, General Dealer. July 25 at 3 at offices of Snell and Greenin, George st, Manxion house
- Williams, Frederick Thomas, Folkestone, Bookseller. July 23 at 3 at the King's Arms Hotel, Folkestone. Wightwick and Gardner, Folkestone
- Williamson, William George, Stockton-on-Tees, Painter. July 24 at 3 at offices of Best, High st, Stockton-on-Tees
- Wilson, Emily, Darlington, Hawser. July 30 at 11 at offices of Dunn and Watson, Mechanic's rd, Darlington
- Winter, Charles Edwin, Ealing, Watchmaker. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Philp, Walbrook
- Woods, William, Maidstone, Dealer in Fancy Goods. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Joles, The Priory, Knightbridge st, Maidstone